

The Reformed Church Review

Volume I

JANUARY, 1922

Number I

I

THE NEW REVIEW

THEODORE F. HERMAN

With this number the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW enters upon a new phase of its long and honorable career. Quite properly, therefore, we may take a parting glance at the past before facing the future. Founded in 1848, by a resolution of the Alumni Association of Marshall College, it made its first appearance in January, 1849. And, save for the five years from 1862-1867, when the exigencies of wartime caused its temporary suspension, it has appeared uninterruptedly until the present day. Thus the REVIEW looks back upon more than seven decades of varied life. Its 68 volumes, containing more than forty thousand pages of reading matter, constitute a very respectable library. And the content of these numerous substantial volumes is remarkable both for its variety and solidity. There is scarcely an aspect of the higher life of man that is not mirrored in the pages of the REVIEW. Theology and religion; philosophy and history; literature and science; education and politics; industry and art; the home, the church, and the state—furnish the topics of its leading articles and there is hardly a phase of the changing life of mankind, since the middle of the last century, that has not left its mark

in our journal. A careful study of its files would enable a student to note the main currents of thought that have swept the world far from its ancient moorings. Throughout its long career, therefore, the REVIEW has never been the organ of the cloister nor the oracle of a cult. Though necessarily edited by the few, it has been open to all. Its dominant interest has been in life. Its supreme endeavor has been to illuminate the life of its times with the gospel, and to interpret it according to the Mind of the Master.

Moreover, the broad scope of the REVIEW is matched by its depth. Bearing in mind that it has never been able to pay even a moderate honorarium for solicited or contributed articles, it is a noteworthy fact that so many men of marked ability have continuously enriched its pages with the fruit of their labor and with the gifts of their love. Not infrequently the articles came from notable men outside the Reformed Church, which in itself is a fine tribute to the REVIEW. But, in the main, the host of contributors was recruited from our own ministry and laity. And the successive volumes of the REVIEW are a living witness, and a perpetual monument, to the men who have preceded us. They reflect their native ability and their professional competence. In character, spirit, and training they were men whose memory we may well cherish with affectionate pride, and whose example we would fain follow. They could think clearly, write plainly, and strive valiantly for the truth as they saw it. No one can read the files of the REVIEW with an open mind, without gaining the conviction that it has not merely served the Reformed Church as an organ for the cultivation and propagation of knowledge, but that it has been one of the few pioneer journals in the exploration, interpretation, and assimilation of the new truth that the Spirit is ever showing unto men. There are not a few articles hidden in its voluminous pages that blaze the way into regions of truth whither the lagging heart of mankind has never yet dared to follow its divine Mas-

ter. They must be accorded a permanent place among the constructive contributions towards that new edifice of theological knowledge that is gradually arising on the one foundation than which none other can be laid.

Mainly, of course, in purpose and fact, the REVIEW has been an organ for the Reformed Church. Hitherto, historical reasons now happily dissolved, have somewhat restricted and circumscribed its sphere of service, and, to that extent, curtailed its usefulness. But even so it would be difficult to exaggerate the value and importance of its manifest services to the Reformed Church. The mere fact of its existence, and of its continued existence in the face of great difficulties, is a suggestive and impressive reminder of the emphasis laid by us upon an *intelligent faith*. The motto on the title-page of the first number of the REVIEW was Anselm's famous saying: *Neque enim quaero intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam*. It affirmed the primacy of faith in the precincts of religious knowledge, but it also recognized the rights of reason in the apprehension and interpretation of Christian truth. There was, for our fathers, no inherent contradiction between revelation and reason, religion and science. Faith and philosophy labored together to apprehend the grace and truth of Jesus Christ, and the REVIEW not merely symbolized that attitude of mind and heart, it also stimulated and quickened it. It challenged our ministry to cultivate their talents and to exercise their gifts. It helped to develop firm believers in Jesus Christ who could commend and defend their faith, clearly and convincingly, with pen and voice, in a questioning and critical age. It saved men from the meshes of a plausible rationalism, and from the mush of a shallow emotionalism. They came to see that atheism and materialism are not legitimate corollaries of evolution, and that Christian theology has no quarrel with science or history. Furthermore, the REVIEW became a repository for official documents of many kinds. It has published the inaugurals of

presidents and professors, the opening sermons of important judicatories, and notable addresses on special occasions. It contains the chronicles of outstanding events and great movements. It has interpreted the life and labors of great leaders of our Church, at the time of their passing. Its many volumes constitute one of the chief source-books of our denominational history. There, in a permanent form, the student of the thought and life of the Reformed Church in the United States will find indispensable material for an accurate and comprehensive narrative. It may be safely affirmed that, merely on this account, the REVIEW has fully vindicated its existence and amply justified the generous expenditure of love, labor, and money involved in its maintenance.

The REVIEW, then, at this new juncture, looks back upon its long career with gratitude and satisfaction. It is one of the oldest journals of its kind in our land, known and honored far beyond our ecclesiastical borders. And in all these years it has endeavored faithfully to serve the cause of Christ. No one even remotely acquainted with religious journalism needs to be told that its career has been one of storm and stress. Its troubles and trials have been many. Several times it has been near death. In fact its very birth was accompanied by much travail of spirit. The first editor, Dr. J. W. Nevin, earnestly recommended the abandonment of the project, because only one hundred subscribers had been secured of the three hundred deemed necessary for the success of the enterprise. And in an *Apology to the Alumni*, an anonymous writer in the first issue speaks of "a sea of uncertainty before them and the hosts of Egypt behind them." But they heard an imperious voice, bidding them "go forward," and we read, "This first number of the REVIEW is the rod of Moses, now stretched upon that sea of doubt. The wind of approbation already blows; the sea begins to divide; Israel is safe; let Egypt beware."

Thus our REVIEW was born. In spite of great difficulties

it was launched with a flourish of trumpets. And so it has been in every recurring crisis in its subsequent career. Every editor has felt the handicap of inadequate support and of insufficient means. There has never been a time when the *REVIEW* numbered five hundred subscribers, or when it could offer adequate financial remuneration for the labor bestowed upon it. Nevertheless, it has maintained itself. Though it was difficult at times to continue its publication, it was found impossible to abandon it. Men were never lacking whose faith in the *REVIEW* was equal to every emergency, and greater than any obstacle. Poor in money, straitened in support, our journal has been exceedingly rich in the personalities of its past editors. It seems fitting, at this turning point, to recall and to record the names of the men whose love and labor have been our greatest asset. From the beginning in 1849 to the present time, the following persons have served as editors: J. W. Nevin, E. V. Gerhart, Philip Schaff, Henry Harbaugh, Thomas G. Apple, John M. Titzel, William Rupp, Geo. W. Richards, John S. Stahr. During these latter years, Prof. Geo. W. Richards and the writer have been the managing editors, assisted by an editorial board composed of members of the faculties of the Theological Seminary at Lancaster and of Franklin and Marshall College. For the readers of this article the roll of the departed editors of the *REVIEW* requires no further comment. Their names shine with a lustre that time cannot dim. They abide in our hearts, both as a sacred memory and as a constant inspiration. And they explain, in large measure, the maintenance of the *REVIEW* in spite of great obstacles, and its high level of excellency in scholarship and workmanship.

Outwardly, under these successive editors, the *REVIEW* underwent many changes. After four years of experimentation the bimonthly journal became a quarterly. It was moved from Mercersburg, its birthplace, to Lancaster. Four times it changed its name. Thrice it issued a new

prospectus and displayed a new motto on its title-page. The baptismal name of the REVIEW was THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW. But in 1853 this was changed to THE MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY, to mark the transition from six to four issues per annum. From 1857-1878 the original name was resumed. When Dr. Thomas G. Apple became the editor, in 1879, THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW made its appearance. Finally, in 1897, Dr. William Kapp gave our journal its present name, THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW. Similar changes occurred in the motto. The founders of the REVIEW nailed Anselm's sententious principle to their masthead, that faith must precede knowledge and that knowledge is not antagonistic to faith. Dr. H. Harbaugh, in 1867, chose a new watchword for the REVIEW, the noble christological confession of Irenæus: *Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia in semet ipsum recapitulans*. In 1879, Dr. T. G. Apple placed Christ's saying on the title-page of the REVIEW, "The truth shall make you free," as a terse summary of its faith and function. And that motto, in a more complete form, has been retained by his successors in the editorial chair.

These changes in name and motto were not merely external alterations, dictated by the caprice of editors. They are the outward expression of an inward growth and development. The REVIEW never changed its character. Beneath all surface alterations and adaptations, and through all the successive editorial administrations, there runs one steadfast aim, which links the latest issue with the first in the kinship of a common spirit. That aim has never been changed. It is clearly stated in the prospectus of 1849, which forms the *Magna Charta* of the REVIEW, and we find it reiterated in the introductory article of every subsequent editorial regime. The journal was founded to serve as an organ for the advancement of theological learning. From its birth it was committed to the frank and full ac-

ceptance of the principle of historical development, and to the firm belief that in the person of Christ we have both the key to the meaning of history and the means of its realization. Thus the way was opened for a theology that was soundly evangelical and safely progressive, profoundly mystical and intensely practical. If the men who walked in that way with burning hearts seemed to chafe, at times, under the demand of rigorous conformity to closed systems of thought and to finished formulas of action, let it be remembered that their impatience with traditional modes of thinking was the direct corollary of their absolute loyalty to Jesus Christ, as the revealer of God and the redeemer of mankind. And if their eager feet carried them into by-paths whither we can no longer follow them, and to positions from which we have receded, let it be said that such things are a part of the price which all pioneers must pay when they follow the enlarging vision of Christ into new regions of thought and into vaster fields of life. The heritage of the fathers that we prize is not their systems of thought, but their vigorous faith in Jesus Christ and their fearless quest of the larger truth contained in His gospel. That spirit runs unchanged through all the volumes of the *REVIEW*. It is the soul of the journal, and the golden bond that binds its many parts into an organic unity.

And because that spirit denoted loyalty to the person of Christ, rather than conformity to a theological system, it was of necessity a growing spirit. The phases of its growth are reflected, in a manner, by the external changes of name and motto noted above. The *REVIEW*, in its past career, has passed successively through three distinct eras. They may be called the controversial, the constructive, and the conciliatory. These cycles of life are not separated by sharp dividing lines. They overlap and interlock and the transition from one to the other is gradual and spontaneous. Nevertheless, they mark the stages of the growth

of the REVIEW, from its somewhat tumultuous youth to its maturity.

First came the controversial period. The founders of the REVIEW were militant thinkers. They were the champions of an unpopular cause, and the early issues of our journal are filled with the echoes of theological controversy. Its baptismal name, THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW, indicates that it proclaimed and espoused the system of philosophy and theology that was taught in the college and seminary located at Mercersburg. There is no need, here and now, to discuss that system. The perspective of time enables friend and foe alike to appreciate, at least, its originality and force. In subsequent years, especially in connection with the liturgical movement in the Reformed Church, the original significance of the Mercersburg theology, so-called, was somewhat obscured. It raised an issue far more fundamental than liturgies, and it precipitated a controversy that was infinitely more vital. The principle for which the Mercersburg theologians contended was embodied in the Anselmic motto chosen for the REVIEW. It magnified faith in the objective facts of the Christian revelation, as contained in the Apostles' Creed, over against a shallow rationalism that denied them; and it emphasized the Church, the ministry, and the sacraments, as embodiments of objective supernatural power and grace, in contrast with Puritan and Methodist forms of belief. Under the inspiration and guidance of this general principle, the Mercersburg theologians plunged vigorously into the living questions of their day, and the REVIEW was the arena where they fought their battles. "The educational character of religion and the catechization of the young; adherence to the regular means established in the Church, in the preaching of the Word and in the administration of the sacraments, over against the use of new and extra measures and means; regard for the Church-year, especially in its leading festivals; the emphasis given to the per-

son of Christ as the principle of spiritual life; reliance upon the supernatural power of Christianity as an object of faith to effect the regeneration of men and the improvement of the world, over against all humanitarian schemes; the acceptance of revelation by faith as necessary to a right rational apprehension of its truths, over against the claims and pretensions of rationalism," these were the main things contended for by the REVIEW in the heroic days of its first period.

But this controversial era speedily ebbed to its close. Its expiring echoes were heard in the liturgical conflict which, for a time, threatened to create a permanent schism in the Reformed Church. Meanwhile the REVIEW had entered upon the second phase of its career, in which the constructive interest became dominant. That constructive era began in 1867, with the resumption of the journal after the Civil War, when Dr. Harbaugh became its editor. Men were in the mood, then, for peace, and in dire need of constructive labor, even as we are today. Moreover, the men who claimed and supported the REVIEW as their organ were convinced that the principles for which they contended had made great progress. The philosophy of Kant and the theology of Schleiermacher had made friends elsewhere in America. Through other channels than those opened at Mercersburg, the historical spirit had gained recognition by American scholars. Solid foundations, at least, had been laid for a fruitful communion of spirit between the Christian thinkers of our land and the regenerated evangelical theology of the continent of Europe. The REVIEW, therefore, girded itself for a new task. It became the organ of construction. In its pages men sought to think out the implications of the Mercersburg theology, and to translate them into the terms of religious life.

At this first turning point in the career of the REVIEW, Dr. Harbaugh retained the old name of the journal, but he chose a new motto for its title-page. And both are sig-

nificant facts. The retention of the old name, THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW, indicates that it was still regarded as the organ of a group within the Reformed Church for the propagation of their distinctive views. But, at the same time, the editor adopted a new motto. He substituted the christological maxim of Irenæus for the Anselmic principle of the primacy of faith and of its harmony with knowledge. And in his introductory article, in the issue of January, 1867, he states the reason for this substitution in the following language. "Mercersburg theology necessarily at first assumed a negating attitude. It denied that the prevailing rationalism, however sugar-coated, was truly Protestant truth, or, in fact, truth of any other kind. It showed its inconsistencies, set forth its deviations from older and better Protestantism, pointed out its necessary downward and destructive tendencies, and challenged its friends to maintain it either on theological, historical, or symbolic grounds. Yet the great progress which the REVIEW has effected, not only in the bosom of the Reformed Church, but also in some directions beyond its bounds, warrants us in now formally assuming a new point of observation. By means of a new motto, we propose to shift the standpoint from a partly negative and wholly anthropological old motto, over into the positive christological heart of the grand mystery of redemption." These editorial utterances clearly indicate a changed attitude of the REVIEW. Hitherto it had been an organ of protest against sectarianism and radicalism. It had led men back to the historical sources of our Christian faith. It had emphasized the objective verities of revelation and religion, over against shallow traditions and vague speculations. But in doing this, the leaders of the Mercersburg movement had not merely been teachers, but students as well. Their own views were clarified. They discerned, with increasing clearness, that the one foundation pillar of Christianity is the person of Christ, as the incarnate Word; and its central

doctrine, the incarnation, as an historical fact grounded in the character of God and in His eternal relation to the universe. Accordingly, they made this organic conception of the incarnation, as an historical process culminating in the person of Christ, the constructive principle of their theology. That is the reason for the choice of the new motto, which affirms this pivotal fact in a striking manner. And a glance at the index of the REVIEW proves how earnestly and ably its editors and contributors strove to work out the principles and conclusions of this christological theology, whose greatest monument is found in the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, published by Dr. E. V. Gerhart.

And thus we are led to the last phase of the REVIEW, which may properly be named the era of conciliation. Dr. Henry Harbaugh already, in the article quoted, struck that note. He said, "Amid the distractions and disintegrating tendencies of the age, the REVIEW proposes to work for conciliation and unity." But he adds, significantly, "even its polemics mean irenics. Though, like our divine Master, it bring a sword, it is a sword that shall strike for peace." The truth is that "conciliation and unity" remained a pious wish for years to come. In fact, it was during this constructive era, in connection with the liturgical controversy, that the Reformed Church drifted perilously near the brink of a schism. Wide differences of settled conviction came to prevail, and two diverse tendencies manifested themselves clearly and forcibly. On both sides stood men of marked ability and equal integrity of purpose, who refused to purchase peace at the price of honest conviction. But, providentially, instead of diverging to the point of violent separation, the two tendencies decided to remain together, freely correcting and supplementing each other. And in the General Synod at Lancaster, in 1878, love had its way. Hearts beat in unison, though theological differences remained as before. The peace proposition was unani-

mously adopted. And the REVIEW gave its hearty endorsement to the declaration of peace. It had played a prominent part in the controversies of the past. Now it eagerly pledged its full support to the efforts of the peace-makers. Dr. T. G. Apple, who became the editor in 1879, says in his introductory article that the journal changed its title and proposed to invite to its pages articles from both sides, in order to lend more effectual aid in bringing the peace measure to a successful termination.

The new name given to the journal was THE REFORMED CHURCH QUARTERLY, which, in 1897, was changed to THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW. The substitution of "Reformed" for "Mercersburg" did not denote the abandonment of its former faith nor the surrender of its principles. But it expressed a spirit infinitely finer, and far more Christian, than even the most perfect system of theology. Dr. Apple said, in the quoted article, "The theology of the Church has not been changed by the peace resolution of the General Synod. Both sides hold the same views that they did before it was passed. It would be simply absurd to expect men to change their theological views merely for the sake of peace. They are not like a coat that can be changed at pleasure. But men *can* lay less stress on theology, and *more* on love. They can agree to disagree with the hope that in time they may see eye to eye. That is what we hope may be the outcome of the present peace movement in the Church, and therefore the REVIEW invites a friendly meeting in its pages, believing that such fellowship will gradually bring about the desired unity, at least so far as theological agreement may be necessary for unity."

With the new name, the REVIEW also adopted a new motto. The theological maxim of Irenæus yielded its place to a saying of Jesus, reported by the great mystic of the New Testament (John 8: 32). And this, again, was a fruit of love. The great mystery of God manifest in the flesh was still regarded as the pivotal doctrine of the

Christian faith. But the new motto suggested that all men know in part. And as they gain a deeper apprehension of the riches of grace and truth revealed in Christ, in the sphere of fraternal love and common labor, the antagonism of the past will be swallowed up and lost in the spirit of Christian unity. It implied that Christian faith is not theological belief, based upon external authority or logical proof, but religious conviction growing out of personal experience.

On this deeper and wider basis the REVIEW has stood during the last four decades. The editors who succeeded Dr. Apple never quenched the spirit of conciliation breathed by his editorial, and they never consciously disobeyed the heavenly vision of unity. They introduced minor changes, both in the title and in the motto, but they were merely an expansion of the same spirit. The expanded title accentuated the honest desire to make the REVIEW the representative theological organ for the entire Reformed Church. And the completed motto embodied the earnest conviction that Christian truth is not the exclusive possession of any one group of thinkers, but, rather, the common quest of all who love the Lord. And a perusal of the files of the REVIEW during this period will show that its hopes were not deceived, nor its labors in vain. Technically, it remained the organ of one school, but practically it became an open forum for all schools, "with an open vision and a cordial welcome for all truth, new as well as old, from whatever quarter it may come." Its contributors came from all parts of the Reformed Church and represented many types and shades of theology. Its contributions covered every reach of thought and all the vast range of applied Christianity. Common interests pushed divisive issues to one side. Even in matters of divergent opinion constructive zeal took the place of controversial ardor. And repeatedly the attempt was made to constitute the REVIEW,

formally and officially, the organ of the entire Reformed Church by a suitable enlargement of its editorial staff.

But there is a fulness of time for the ripening of the fruit of the spirit that men must await in patient faith. It cannot be hastened by mechanical measures. It comes only through the processes of organic growth and development. And, coming thus, it is spontaneous and irresistible. The fact that, with this issue, the REVIEW appears as the official organ of the Reformed Church in the United States, as represented by all of her theological seminaries, indicates that a profound change has been wrought in our denominational life. We are living in a new fulness of time, and we are not unmindful, as a Church, of its demands and duties. The year 1849, the birth-year of the REVIEW, marked a similar era, though far less crucial and portentous than the present. In the first article published in our journal, Dr. J. W. Nevin uses language that applies strikingly to our times. Speaking of the year 1848, he says, "It was the outward end of much that is past, and the beginning, outwardly, of a great deal that is to come. A year of revolution and change; of uncertainty, anxiety, and alarm; answering to the prophetic imagery of signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; the powers of heaven shaken, and the order of the world thrown violently out of course. A year of mystery for the nations, involving a deep burden which the whole civilized earth is concerned to bear and to understand. Who shall pretend to fathom its sense? Who shall tell the mighty secret that lies hid within its sybil leaves?" The seer of today discerns similar portents in the tumult and turmoil of our times. We, too, believe that a "mighty secret" is struggling to find expression in the life of mankind. It is the "mystery of godliness" which Christ has revealed, and the miracle of the consummation of His kingdom on earth. And as a Church, united in spirit, we are eager to meet the imperious challenge of our age, in thought and life. Party strife and sectional

bias belong to the past. Today our one desire is to coöperate in fathoming the mystery of godliness, and in spelling out its glories in terms of Christlike life. We will not now trace the genesis of this larger spirit in our Reformed Church. It is the growth of ages, hastened to its fruition by the tragedy of the war and by the insistent pressure of great spiritual and practical problems. But we recognize its existence with profound gratitude. It manifested itself in the Forward Movement, and it reveals itself here in the new REVIEW. The faculties of the three theological seminaries of the Reformed Church in the United States have formally adopted the REVIEW as their organ. Prof. A. S. Zerbe, D.D., of Central Seminary, and Prof. A. E. Dahlmann, D.D., of the Mission House, have been officially chosen, by their respective faculties, to become the associates of the present managing editors in the publication of the journal. Henceforth the REVIEW will be fully entitled to its inclusive and representative name. It will be THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW.

This reconstruction of the editorial board does not carry with it a new policy. With its name, the REVIEW retains also its spirit and motto. It will strive to conform strictly to the principles avowed in its historical prospectus. "Freedom of thought within the limits of Christian Truth" will remain its watchword. Not the perpetuation of theological systems, but the promotion of God's kingdom will be its chief aim. These priceless privileges, inherited from our fathers, we share gladly with all our brethren in the editorial chair, and with the rank and file of our ministry and laity. The old issues, that engaged our fathers, are dead or superseded. But we face new problems, whose solution calls for men of faith who will think and work together in freedom. Accordingly, we shall welcome contributions from every source, provided they fall within the scope of the REVIEW and measure up to its standards.

Certain changes in the outward appearance and mechani-

cal make-up of our journal will doubtless meet with general approval. They make it more pleasing to the eye, as well as more serviceable. A new series (the fifth) was started to mark the reconstruction of the editorial management. The size of each number will be somewhat reduced. But the editors hope to offer compensating advantages in the quality and timeliness of the contents. Each number will contain editorial writings, besides contributed and solicited articles from other sources. Special attention will be given to the notices of new books by competent men. The editors hope to introduce new features into the REVIEW, in the course of time, and to issue special numbers, as circumstances may demand. They also desire the REVIEW to remain, as heretofore, the repository for official and authoritative documents relating to the Reformed Church.

That the Reformed Church of the present day *needs* an organ such as this new REVIEW admits of no reasonable doubt. It moves in a sphere that is distinctively its own, and in this sphere there is, at this time, no other claimant. But whether she *wants* it remains to be seen. The proof of that will be the adequate patronage and support of the venture by our clergy and laity. The work of preparing and publishing such a REVIEW will be no light task. And it will still remain, very largely, a labor of love. A corresponding obligation rests on every member of the Church to support the REVIEW in every possible way. The two chief needs are subscriptions and contributions. It should not be difficult to enlarge our circle of readers very materially, since the REVIEW has been officially adopted by the entire Church. It should find its way into every study, and into the homes of our intelligent laity. And from this larger constituency we also expect, with much confidence, a constant stream of fresh material. We desire compact articles on vital themes of every description. They should

rarely exceed ten to fifteen pages in length. And we plead for original articles, written expressly for the REVIEW. Essays, addresses, and sermons prepared for special occasions may often contain valuable material for articles, but they should be re-written.

It may be of interest to the readers of the REVIEW to learn that some of its generous friends have started to raise an endowment fund of \$10,000 for its maintenance. May we not ask those who are financially able to assist in the speedy completion of this fund? The REVIEW should become financially self-maintaining in the very near future, through an adequate number of subscriptions. But even then a moderate endowment fund will be a welcome addition to its resources. It will enable the editors to enrich its columns with special articles by men of note.

As the MERCERSBURG REVIEW and as the MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY, this journal, for almost half a century, was intimately connected with development of the Reformed Church in the United States. Indeed, it was one of the important factors of this development. Within the Church it helped to mould a distinct denominational consciousness, and it also became an organ of communication with the theological and religious world beyond our bounds. Our denominational life today, and our position among the religious forces of our land, are due, in no small measure, to the REVIEW. And then, as the REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW and as the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, this journal assisted in laying the foundations for the unified Church of today. We close the annals of the past with the sincere prayer that much greater results may be achieved by the new REVIEW. There is every reason to entertain that hope. The time is ripe for building a noble superstructure on the foundations that have been laid. And, if we may be permitted to suggest a heading for the new phase of its long career upon which the REVIEW has now been launched, we shall call it "*The Creative Era.*" We are convinced that,

as a denomination, we have a distinctive contribution to make towards the nobler type of Christianity that is in process of formation. We have been prepared for it providentially. And we are ready for it. Let us make the REVIEW one of the channels through which our contribution towards the establishment of God's kingdom may flow into the world.

LANCASTER, PA.

II

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SUPERNATURAL CONCEPTION OF JESUS CHRIST

A. S. ZERBE

FIRST PART

The doctrine of the person of Christ has always been regarded as of fundamental significance in any attempt to systematize the truths and evaluate the real character of Christianity. Such subjects as the preëxistence and person of the Logos, the relation of the two natures, the two states (humiliation and exaltation), the manner of his birth (whether by supernatural conception or merely human procreation), his death and resurrection, and, in short, his whole life and ministry, must be viewed in their inner unity and relation as integral parts of a profound plan for the salvation of man.

Recently, again, that baffling and ever attractive subject, variously known as the virgin birth, the miraculous birth and the supernatural conception, has come to the front, not only in ponderous theological quarterlies and scientific journals (discussions on parthenogenesis), but also in popular magazines, newspaper articles, the open forum, women's clubs and semi-popular sermons. The doctrine of evolution, a widely current naturalistic world-view, a widespread revolt against traditional Church doctrines and a half laudable, half morbid, public desire to pry into the genesis of life, have led to all kinds of attempts either to place the old doctrine on a firmer basis, to modify it, or to reject it altogether. The self-assurance of the modern woman no less than of the modern man in settling off-hand an inscrutable mystery is signally exhibited by a London

preacher, Miss A. Maude Royden, who opens a sermon on "Can We Believe in the Virgin Birth?" with the avowal: "I am going to preach tonight what some of you may think a very unsatisfactory sermon, because, to be honest with you, I have not entirely made up my own mind on this extraordinarily difficult question" (*Reformed Church Messenger*, September 8 and 15). The sermon is, accordingly, a remarkable farrago of misconceptions and half-baked ideas. Again, "I am not a theologian, except in the sense that I am persuaded that theology is the business of every man and woman." We accept the first half of this statement, but challenge the second. It is no more the business of "every man and woman" to discuss the profound questions of theology than it is to discuss the technical questions of law, medicine or any other science requiring professional skill and logical acumen.

It seems opportune, therefore, to state the real nature of the problem, to discuss the various outstanding theories, and to reach, if possible, some definite conclusions. The writer, not having any new or startling hypothesis to advance, essays the humble rôle of inquiring into the legitimacy of old and traditional views and of recent attempts to discredit them.¹

I. The Scripture Passages in Dispute.

The controversy hinges on the interpretation of certain parts of the first two chapters in the Gospel according to Matthew and parts of the first three chapters of the Gos-

¹ In the literature of our subject, the phrase "virgin birth" is quite generally employed rather than "supernatural conception." Though no less an authority than Romanes assures us that parthenogenesis is indeed rare and unique in the higher orders and does not "betoken any breach of physiological continuity," it is nevertheless in such cases a purely natural phenomenon, whereas in the case under review the supernatural is the determining factor. Except then as an accommodation to traditional usage, we regard the phrase "supernatural conception" as more accurately expressing the points at issue. See fuller discussion of parthenogenesis below.

pel according to Luke; or, more specifically, certain verses in these Gospels, as Matt. 1: 18-25 and Luke 1: 26-36 and 3: 23 compared with Matthew 1: 16. In Matthew 1: 20-25 we read: "But when he (Joseph) thought on these things, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: *for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit.* And she shall bring forth a son; and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins. Now all this is come to pass, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, Behold, the virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God with us. And Joseph arose from his sleep, and did as the angel of the Lord commanded him, and took unto him his wife; *and knew her not till she had brought forth a son;* and he called his name Jesus." In Luke 1: 26-35 we read: "Now in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth (27) *to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph,* of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. (28) And he came in unto her and said, *Hail, thou art highly favored, the Lord is with thee.* (29) But she was greatly troubled at the saying, and cast in her mind what manner of salutation this might be. (30) And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favor with God. (31) And behold, *thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son,* and shalt call his name Jesus. (32) He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: (33) And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever: and of his kingdom there shall be no end. (34) *And Mary said unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?* (35) *And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Spirit*

shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also the holy thing which is begotten shall be called the Son of God."

Language could not more clearly express the idea of a supernatural conception. As a legitimate deduction, the Church of all ages, ancient, mediæval and modern, Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic and Protestant, has subscribed to the third article of the Apostles' Creed, "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." It is the retention, or the rejection, of this article, as well as of the above cited Scripture, which is the bone of contention.

II. *Authenticity and Genuineness of the Narratives.*

In discussing, as necessity requires, the authenticity and integrity of the Gospel narratives, and specifically of Matthew 1: 18-25 and Luke 1: 31-35, we enter at once the field of the textual or lower and that of the literary-historical or so-called higher criticism, every inch of which as bearing on our subject is contested territory.

1. *The Text.*—To what extent are the above passages authenticated by ancient sources? The answer in brief is that the very oldest manuscripts and versions without exception contain them. Thus, among the great uncials, our highest authorities, the passages are found in the Vatican (B), and the Sinaitic (Aleph). The Alexandrian manuscript (A) is mutilated down as far as Matthew 25, but chapters one and two of Luke are there. The passages stand also in the Codex Ephraemi (C) and the Codex Bezae (D). These, as the oldest types of manuscripts, ordinarily outweigh all other sources combined. Their readings, however, are attested by the cursives without any important exception. Translations of the New Testament into Latin, Syriac, and other languages having been made at an early date, the testimony of the versions is peculiarly valuable. The chapters containing the whole of the birth-narratives are found not only in the Vulgate of Jerome, but also in the

Old Latin versions going back to the time of Tertullian. One of the decisive proofs that the sections in question formed a part of the original Gospel is the fact that they are contained in the famous old Syriac Harmony of the Gospels, the Diatessaron of Tatian, about 165 A.D., though the genealogies are missing, possibly as unsuitable for the author's purpose. They are contained also in the Syriac versions, the Peshitta, and the Curetonian, and in all the Egyptian (Coptic) versions.

Extra-canonical proof to the same effect is not wanting. Thus the so-called *Gospel of the Hebrews*, an Aramaic version of Matthew formerly regarded by some as the original of our Matthew, contains every verse of the chapters in question. Such overwhelming evidence, which goes back to an age close to the Apostolic, can be set aside only by the most arbitrary expedients.

2. *Accepted by the Apostolic and Patristic Church.*—As a legitimate deduction from Scripture, the doctrine of the virgin birth was at an early date (Zahn, 120 A.D., Harnack, 150) incorporated in the Apostles' Creed and accepted practically by the whole ancient Church. Thus Justin Martyr (middle of the second century) says: "We say also that the Word, who is the first-born of God, was produced *without sexual union*." He clearly means that Jesus Christ as the preëxisting Word of God was born of a virgin without sexual union with Joseph or any other man. Holding that the virgin birth was predicted in Isaiah 7: 14, Justin proceeds: "This, then, signifies that a virgin should conceive, *without intercourse*. For if she had had intercourse with any one whatever, she was no longer a virgin; but the power of God, having come upon her, overshadowed her and caused her, while yet a virgin, to conceive." Hippolytus writes: "The Word was the first-born of God, who came down from heaven to the blessed Mary, and was made a first-born man in her womb." Irenæus says: "Why did he come down into her, if he were

to take nothing of her?" Tertullian, in paraphrasing the third article of the Apostles' Creed, writes: "This Word, at last brought down by the Spirit and Power of God, into the virgin Mary, was made flesh in her womb and being born of her, went forth as Jesus Christ." Such is the uniform testimony of the Fathers.²

Among the early Apologists is Aristides (ca. 125 A.D.), a Syriac translation of whose *Apology* has recently been recovered and which states as part of the general Christian faith that the Son of God "from a Hebrew virgin took and clad Himself with flesh." Dr. Rendel Harris, editor of the *Apology*, says: "Everything that we know of the dogmatics of the early part of the second century agrees with the belief that, at that period, the virginity of Mary was a part of the formulated Christian belief" (*Apology*, p. 25).

In their controversies with Jews and heretics, the early Fathers discuss elaborately the fact and nature of Christ's supernatural conception. In his *Dialogue with Trypho*, one of the acutest of controversial writings, Justin Martyr voices the generally accepted doctrine. Trypho, the Jew, said: "You endeavor to prove an incredible and well-nigh impossible thing, that God endured to be born and become man." Justin replies: "If I undertook to prove this by doctrines and arguments of men, you should not bear with me. But if I quote frequently Scriptures, and

² Ignatius in a passage too lengthy to be quoted here (*Eph. XIX, 1* and *Smyrn. I, 1*) distinctly asserts the virginity of Mary. "Swete calls attention to the fact that the testimony of Ignatius is made more valuable by the nature of his argument. He is arguing with Docetics, and is urging against them the reality of the birth of Jesus. It would, therefore, have suited his purpose to point to the natural birth; but instead of this he says in effect that, though of course supernatural, the birth was yet real" (J. G. Machen, *Princeton Theological Review*, III, p. 646). Harnack, therefore, writes: "Ignatius has freely reproduced a *kerugma* of Christ, which seems in essentials to be of a fairly definite historical character, and which contained, *inter alia*, the Virgin Birth, Pontius Pilate and the *apethanen*."

so many of them, referring to the point, and ask you to comprehend them, you are hard-hearted in the recognition of the mind and will of God."

Excepting the Ebionites, or narrow section of Jewish Christians, and a few Gnostics, every group of Christians in early times accepted as part of their faith the birth of Jesus from the Virgin Mary. Against those Gnostics, however, who accepted the doctrine, but explained it as a more or less unreal event, the Fathers firmly set themselves, holding that while Jesus had a real and true body, he was supernaturally conceived and born. He came, as said Tertullian, "to consecrate a new order of birth."

That such was the undoubted teaching of the early Church is allowed by modern Church historians, even of the liberal school. Thus Lobstein writes: "The common source of all this patristic testimony is the double tradition contained in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke: the *consensus* so urgently insisted upon is accounted for by the fact that all the writers quoted went back to two of our Gospels." Accepting the fact of such "patristic testimony," Lobstein, nevertheless, argues that it rests *only* on two Gospels and so is to be viewed with suspicion. But unless "the double tradition" and the "patristic testimony" attest a fact there is no such thing as unbiassed literary-historical criticism.³

III. *Integrity and Credibility of the Narratives.*

So far, then, as the textual evidence goes, the narratives are unimpeachable. But some investigators, leaving the textual criticism, appeal to the so-called higher or inner criticism, which, covering the trustworthiness, integrity and credibility of the parts of Scripture in question, is a much

³ It will be seen that Lobstein, Schmiedel, Usener and others, not being able to controvert the *fact* of the Gospel and patristic testimony, seek to show that such testimony sprang up long after the time of Christ, and so lacks at once authenticity, genuineness and credibility.

more delicate and difficult procedure, notably in this connection. On the assumption of the impossibility of miracles and of the supernatural, the attempt has been made to delete the passages recording the supernatural conception, especially Matthew 1: 20 and Luke 1: 34, 35 (see quotations above, p. 21). The syllogism runs thus: (1) Any narratives implying supernatural occurrences are to be deleted; (2) The narratives of the virgin birth imply supernatural occurrences; (3) Therefore, the narratives of the virgin birth are to be deleted. Hence, despite the pretence of a fair and impartial inquiry, a critic who denies the possibility of special divine intervention in human history (even in great crises) has virtually settled the question in advance. It may be observed in passing that the highly lauded literary-historical criticism of the Old and the New Testament is not always a legitimate application of critical principles on the basis of language, style and historical setting, but quite frequently a series of assertions and inferences deduced from a world-view or philosophy which sees nothing but a dead level of natural law, designated since the time of John Stuart Mill as the invariability or uniformity of nature (*System of Logic*) and accepted by certain groups of scientists, philosophers and theologians as established beyond a peradventure. If, therefore, the exegete or critic is disposed to hold that the intervention of God, even in so stupendous an event as the incarnation of the Son of the Highest, is an impossibility, he is logically driven to delete the relevant passages or to emasculate them.

It is true also, that if the critic or exegete accepts a world-view allowing an *apriori* possibility of miracles, he will be disposed to regard the narratives as credible. One comes, therefore, to the consideration of the subject with a certain bias or viewpoint, as Herbert Spencer would say, but, let us hope, with a bias or viewpoint (scientific, philosophic, or theological) which does not render an impartial weighing of the evidence impossible.

1. *Conjectural Emendation.*—It will be observed that our inquiry at this point virtually resolves itself into the question whether, according to textual and literary-historical criticism, the above passages contained in the standard editions of the Greek New Testament should be accepted as they stand, or should be emended and in fact deleted. Dr. Schaff states the limitations of criticism: "Textual criticism is confined to the original form and integrity of the text, as far as it can be established by documentary evidence. It aims to show, not what the apostles and evangelists might have written, but simply what they actually did write. It has nothing to do with sectarian notions and tenets, or subjective likes and dislikes, but only with facts."

As the New Testament before the invention of printing was transmitted through hand-made copies and, as even with the greatest care, minor errors of transcription crept into the text, it has become necessary to collate the multitude of various readings with the view of restoring the original text, but always on the basis of transcriptional evidence. In the event that such evidence is seemingly or really insufficient to reach certainty, a critic is disposed to decide from internal phenomena what the Biblical writer actually said. He now leaves the field of the lower criticism and enters that subhead of literary-historical criticism known as "conjectural emendation." Editors of Latin and Greek classics, finding in the paucity of manuscripts, a text defective or corrupt, occasionally resort to conjectural emendation, or restoration of what they conceive the author to have actually written. Proceeding from a purely subjective opinion of the critic, it is a bold and hazardous expedient, rarely resorted to, even in classic studies.

The great New Testament textual critics, Bentley, Tregelles, Scrivener, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, have looked with disfavor on all attempts to modify or excise the text on the basis of conjecture. At best, conjectural emendation can be employed in dealing with Bib-

lical texts only when the transcriptional and the internal evidence point in the same direction. Westcott and Hort write: "The folly and frivolity of once popular conjectures have led to a wholesome reaction against looking beyond documentary tradition. . . . A strong presumption in favor of the immunity of the text of the New Testament from errors antecedent to existing documents is afforded by the facts just mentioned" (*The N. T. in the Original Greek*, p. 277). Such are the conclusions reached by leading scholars regarding conjectural emendation.⁴

2. *Passages Alleged to be Late Insertions.*—We proceed now to examine some of the grounds on which the integrity of the birth-narratives has been impeached. These have often been stated and are found in the extensive literature of the subject from the earliest to the latest times. It suffices here to review the objections urged by such critics as Harnack, Schmiedel, Lobstein, and Usener. A summary of the chief objections is found in the articles "Mary," by P. S. Schmiedel, and "Nativity," by H. Usener, in Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica* and relative articles in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Schmiedel allows that, though Jesus never appeals to "the manner of his birth," this must not be pressed, "for it can be urged that the silence arises from a delicate reserve which would be easy to understand" (*op. cit.*, col.

⁴ Richard Bentley, the real founder of the literary-historical criticism, rather than, as generally held, F. A. Wolf (*Prolegomena ad Homerum*, 1795), established the spuriousness of the so-called *Epistles of Phalaris* by showing from internal evidence that they mentioned towns, words and authors not in existence until long after the time of Phalaris (ca. 550 B.C.). His success in this field filled the learned world with astonishment, since for fifteen centuries the *Epistles* had universally been regarded as genuine. It is this same Bentley who in his *Prospectus* for a new edition of the New Testament writes: "In the sacred writings there is no place for conjectures and emendations. Diligence and fidelity, with some judgment and experience, are the characters here requisite." Tregelles says: "We possess so many MSS. and we are aided by so many versions, that we are never left to the need of conjecture as the means of removing errata."

2954). "But," says Schmiedel, "we find expressions used by him which seem to exclude the idea of a virgin birth. In Matthew 12: 28 he declares that he casts out devils by the spirit of God," which Schmiedel thinks means that "the spirit had been bestowed upon him subsequent to his birth"; but surely this claim of casting out demons by the Spirit (not spirit) of God is not contrary to nor inconsistent with such endowment by the Spirit at his conception.

Schmiedel holds further that the statement, Matthew 12: 48, "Who is my mother? and Who are my brethren?" would have been "an impossibility if Jesus had possessed consciousness that his mother had been deemed worthy of a position so exalted as we are now speaking of." This at the first glance looks formidable; but a closer examination reveals that Jesus intended, not to deny his family relationships, but to emphasize the new ties of kindred established by the spiritual birth.⁵

Again, Mark 3: 21 reads: "And when his friends heard of it, they went out to lay hold on him: for, they said, he is beside himself." Schmiedel writes: "Had Mary known of the supernatural origin of Jesus, as set forth in Luke 1: 35, could anything have induced her to say that he was beside himself?" (*op. cit.*, col. 2955). The sufficient answer is, that it was not "she," but "they" who employed such language. If the rejoinder be that the "they" were her kinsmen, Mary included (though the narrative has "friends"), the sufficient sur-rejoinder is that the text nowhere states or implies that the language or thought was hers; and so Schmiedel and those who train with him are guilty of reading an unwarranted meaning into the episode.

Schmiedel urges that Luke 2: 33, "his father and his mother were marvelling at the things which were spoken concerning him," and 2: 50, "and they understood not the

⁵ Dr. Philip Schaff, commenting on verse 51, writes "Note that Christ does not introduce the term *father*, since he had no human father. A hint of the mystery of the supernatural conception" (*Com. on Matthew*, p. 232).

saying which he spake unto them," bear witness "against the virgin birth." On the contrary, what is said of the Virgin, 2: 19, "but Mary kept all these sayings, pondering them in her heart," throws an interesting side-light on her inner knowledge and confirms the credibility of the narratives. It is psychologically and ethically true to nature, a fine touch of motherly instinct and prudence. As says Plummer: "Mary could have no such astonishment; neither did she publish her impressions. The revelations to Joseph and herself precluded both" (*Commentary on Luke*, p. 60). That the parents, even though having knowledge of his miraculous birth, should not be able to comprehend his "sayings" or fathom the depths of his teaching is at once a proof of limited human understanding and verisimilitude.⁶

3. *The Contention regarding Luke 1: 34, 35.*—Schmiedel holds that Luke 1: 34, 35 is "a later insertion" and so lacks authenticity and credibility. With him agree Pfeleiderer, Harnack, Hillmann, Usener and indeed the whole group of liberal (or shall we say naturalistic?) critics. As the chief attack against the integrity of the Gospel narratives centers here, it becomes necessary to state the nature and cogency of the critical principles relied upon for the deletion not only of Luke 1: 34, 35, but of other passages standing in the way of such critics. Schmiedel affirms that since 1: 34, 35 "disturbs the connection," it must be regarded "as a later insertion." But, according to all canons of internal criticism, an ancient writer must be regarded as the judge of what disturbs or does not disturb the connection, rather than some modern university pundit who in his *Studierzimmer* and from his inner consciousness excogitates what must have been said

⁶ Even Keim is constrained to say: "This fine tender picture, in which neither truth to nature, nor the beauty which that implies, is violated in a single line . . . cannot have been devised by human hands, which, when left to themselves, were always betrayed into coarseness and exaggeration, as shown by the apocryphal gospels."

and how it ought to have been said if said at all. As every student of Hebrew and New Testament Greek knows, additions, supplementary statements, parenthetical clauses were frequently injected into Old and New Testament narratives contrary to our modern stylistic rules. Even classic modern writers often set at defiance the technical rules of grammar, composition and diction. What Eduard Koenig has exhaustively pointed out as to insertions, omissions, peculiar arrangement of matter and the "*manche Nüancierungen der Darstellung*" (vid. *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die Biblische Litteratur*), which an Old Testament and to some extent a New Testament writer allows himself, is applicable to the admittedly Hebraistic coloring of the Lucan passages in question.

Schmiedel's objection is that verses 34 and 35 unnaturally separate verses 31 and 32 from 36 (see verses above). *Per contra*, verse 36, "and behold, Elizabeth, thy kinswoman, etc.," certainly follows verse 35 more naturally than it would verse 33, ending with "and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Verse 34 is clearly an amplification of the thought in 32, "Son of the Most High," and of verse 33. Far from disturbing "the connection" these verses are demanded by the connection and are in accord with the whole narrative.

Again, it is alleged that verse 35 is a repetition of and inconsistent with 31 and 32 in that Jesus is called "the Son of God," verse 31, which is a doublet of "Son of the Most High." Here, again, the Hebrew stylistic expedient of parallelism is in evidence and anticipates the record in 34 and 35. Hilgenfeld concedes that the phrase "the Son of the Most High" does not exclude the statements of verses 34 and 35; and so Luke naturally reaches the climax in these verses.

Further, it is claimed that Luke 1: 36, 37 has a suitable meaning only if it follows 32 and 33. But, as seen above, it is the ancient writer, having his own idea of logical

sequence, and not a modern stylist, who is the judge of what is or is not suitable. Luke, it is generally conceded, is the most versatile of the New Testament authors and writes in a Hebraic or Hellenic style as matter or purpose dictates. Though capable of writing in classic Greek (as in Luke 1: 1-4; Acts 1: 1-5) he is a law unto himself in mixed constructions, broken sentences, various irregularities and conformity to Hebrew or Greek usage. No one can state in advance how he will present a matter. On Schmiedel's hypothesis one could claim that Luke 8: 28: "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God?" is non-Lucan, since in thought and expression it is similar to 1: 32, 35. Such are Schmiedel's arguments for deleting 1: 34, 35, feeble, futile and fatuous.

Harnack proceeds along the same lines. At the end of a lengthy discussion, characterized by an arbitrary treatment of the text, he writes: "After these few and easy deletions, which are *required* as soon as we are convinced of the interpolation of verses 34 and 35, but which otherwise obtrude themselves upon us, the narrative is smooth and nowhere presupposes the virgin birth."

But the negative critics, having gotten rid of Luke 1: 34, 35, discover that 1: 27, "a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary," stares them in the face. Although it stands in all the chief manuscripts and versions, they forthwith, in defiance of all transcriptional evidence, delete it in order to save a preconceived and arbitrary hypothesis. But their extremity is greater than ever, for 2: 5 confronts them: "And Joseph went up from Galilee . . . to enrol himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him (Greek, *emnesteu mene*), being great with child (Gr. *ouse engkuoi*)."

This verse must accordingly be emasculated on textual or inner grounds. As a slender basis for such a procedure, alternative readings in late codices are seized upon to discredit the received text. Schmiedel

would excise the words "betrothed to him, being great with child" and substitute "with Mary his wife," which he says "is vouched for, not merely by old Latin codices, as well as Syriac Sin., but even more by the manifest impossibility of its ever having arisen by later corruption" (*op. cit.*, col. 2955).

Over against this is the critical conclusion of a high authority, Dr. Alfred Plummer, of University College, Durham, who writes: "The *gunaiki* (wife) of A, Vulgate, Syriac, and Ethiopic is a gloss. . . . Had she been only his betrothed (1: 27; Matt. 1: 18), their travelling together would have been impossible. But by omitting *gunaiki* Luke intimates what Matthew states 1: 25. The *ouse* introduces, not a mere fact, but the reason for what has just been stated. Not, he had her with him, and she happened to be with child, but, he took her with him, *because* she was with child" (*Intern. Crit. Com.*, Luke, p. 53). Schmiedel's logic is absolutely illicit.⁷

4. The Schmiedel-Usener Conjectural Emendations.—

We come now to the most remarkable attempt at conjectural emendation in the whole range of criticism, classic or Biblical. Usener sees that if the above deletions are made, one would expect to find some notice of the marriage of Joseph and Mary, of which nothing is found in the

⁷The whole discussion on the text of Lk. 2: 5 may be summed up in the language of Dr. J. G. Machen: "Harnack supposes that the word *parthenos* in 1: 27 is an interpolation made by the redactor who added verses 34, 35. For, he says, the word *emnesteumene* in 2: 5 can only mean *wife*, so that the same author could never have written a few verses back *parthenou emnesteumenen*. One of the words must be removed, and the most natural one to remove is, of course, *parthenou*. But this really begs the question. For *emnesteumene* in 2: 5 means simply *wife* only on the supposition that 1: 34, 35 are to be deleted—which is exactly the thing to be proved. . . . The reading with both *emnesteumene* and *gunaiki* is evidently to be dismissed at once as a mixed reading. Now of course this leaves the overwhelming manuscript authority in favor of *emnesteumene* without *gunaiki*, and this authority has been followed by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Baljon, etc. (*Princeton Theolog. Rev.*, IV, pp. 53, 54).

mutilated Harnack-Schmiedel-Usener text. Usener is equal to the occasion and so he complacently writes: "We are in a position to infer with certainty from Luke 2: 5 that in the original form of the narrative after 1: 38 stood the further statement, hardly to be dispensed with (even though judged inadmissible by the redactor who interpolated 1: 34, 35), that Mary was then taken to wife by Joseph, and that she conceived by him" (*op. cit.*, col. 3350). This is a most extraordinary procedure. Usener rejects without the slightest proof the readings attested by all the authorities, but at once sees the necessity of restoring something to take the place of what has been rejected. He then proceeds to read into the assumed original text a meaning wholly foreign to the context and with the characteristic anti-supernaturalistic bias of his school affirms that Mary "conceived by him (Joseph)," that is, *not* by the Holy Ghost. When we recall that conjectural emendation is allowable only when it meets all the requirements of both transcriptional and internal evidence and that in fact no Biblical conjectural emendation entirely satisfactory to all critics has ever been made, Schmiedel's violent emendation of these pivotal texts is the most arbitrary and unwarranted procedure in the whole range of criticism.

In short, we must agree with J. Weiss, that, since the birth-narratives are found in all the standard manuscripts and versions of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, they must be regarded as authentic, genuine and credible.

DAYTON, O.

III

THE PRESENT STATUS OF CHURCH UNION

GEORGE W. RICHARDS

Two apparently contradictory movements came in the wake of the war. The one was for closer relations among the Churches; the other for intensification of the denominational spirit. The Inter-Church World Movement and the American Council on Organic Union of Evangelical Churches were the result of the former, the first a failure and the second so far not a success; the Forward Movements, under different names, in the various Churches were part cause and part evidence of the latter. The recrudescence of denominationalism was paralleled by the revival of nationalism, each deferring, if not defeating, the ardent hopes and the practical schemes of a new interdenominationalism and a new internationalism. With a show of reason, therefore, the Rev. L. W. McCreary writes in the *Christian Century*: "It was thought that the church would profit by the experiences of the war and that hereafter a closer unity and coöperation would characterize all religious endeavor. Instead it may be seriously doubted if there has been a time in the last twenty years when denominationism has been more assertive."

The reaction, if it temporarily stayed, however, has not suppressed efforts for church union. The urge for it at present is world-wide, felt most keenly on the foreign mission fields and working persistently in every Protestant land of Europe and America. The delegates of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, commonly known as Greek Catholic, submitted a union proposal to the Preliminary Meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order at Geneva in 1920. The Roman Catholic Church, though refusing to

join in conference with other Churches, is always ready to welcome the prodigal sects to the fold of Holy Mother. A brief survey of union movements in different countries will enable us to form some idea of their breadth and depth.

1. Let us turn to England. Here the issue is the union of the Established Church and the non-conforming Churches, Presbyterian, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist. The Lambeth Appeal of 1920, though addressed to all Christendom, came with special force to the Christian bodies of England. It called forth numerous replies; most, if not all of them, were frank and yet friendly. Indeed the Appeal itself was preceded by two notable reports of a joint committee of Anglicans and of representatives of the English Free Churches' Commission. In these reports (1916 and 1918), which contain a statement on points of agreement and of difference in matters relating to faith and order, three common convictions stand out significantly so far as future negotiations are concerned. They are as follows: (1) "It is the purpose of our Lord that believers in Him should be one visible society, and this unity is essential to the purpose of Christ for His Church and for its effective witness and work by the world;" (2) "The visible unity of the Body of Christ is not adequately expressed in the coöperation of the Christian Churches for moral influence and social service; though such coöperation might with great advantage be carried much further than it is at present, it could only be fully realized through community of worship, faith and order, including common participation in the Lord's Supper;" (3) "That continuity with the historic Episcopate should be effectively preserved." The condition, however, is added that "the Episcopate should re-assume a constitutional form, both as regards the method of election of the bishop as by clergy and people and the method of government after the election."

These convictions have been reiterated in recent responses to the Lambeth Appeal by leaders of the Free Churches, notably, in a Report of a Committee of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and the National Free Church Council and in an article by Principal Garvie. There are, however, men in the Free Churches who dissent from one or all of these statements, denying that the divine ideal of the Church is "an outward visible united society," or that there should be more than co-operation in moral and social service without corporate union, or that the historic episcopate should be preserved in the proposed union of the Churches.

The point of difference between the Anglicans and the dissenting bodies is not merely a doctrine or a rite which, if eliminated, would at once remove the barrier to union. It is far more a difference rooted in two distinct interpretations of Christianity, the one Catholic and the other Protestant. Nowhere is this more manifest than in the conception of the Church. It is a question whether a particular faith (creed) and order are an historical product, or a permanent foundation, of the Church. If the latter, they are unchangeable and indispensable to its being; if the former, they are not necessarily permanent and regulative in its doctrine and government for all time to come.

On this point Principal Garvie says: "The Gospel made the Church, and the Church's primary function is to preach the Gospel, and to this preaching the administration of the Sacraments as the signs and seals of the truth and grace offered in the preached Gospel must be subordinated. . . . As Christ's promise of His permanent presence and supreme authority has been fulfilled in the experience of believers that grace is not an impersonal thing or force preserved in and communicated by any ordinance. Whether the Gospel is heard or the Sacrament is received, it is Christ Himself who saves and blesses. While He founded the Christian Community, He does not stand at

the head of a historical succession, to which alone He has delegated the communication of His grace; but He Himself is always and everywhere active in immediate contact and intimate communion with the soul of man. The sole condition of receiving and responding to this grace is faith, inclusive of repentance. The perfect sufficiency of Christ Himself on the sole condition of faith unto justification, sanctification and glorification—this is the core of the Gospel. . . . Because the freedom of His Spirit and not the bondage of the letter results from Christ's own continued presence and constant activity, no organization, however venerable or general, can be regarded as alone regular and valid. Thus the episcopate, whether it has or has not been for the advantage of the communions which possess it, cannot be regarded as essential to the Church. Christ alone, bound by no historic episcopate or apostolic succession in the freedom of His grace, is all-sufficient to call to and endue with all needed grace for the ministry of the whole Church."¹

If a union of the English Churches is to be effectually accomplished, it must be done by a reconciliation of the fundamental antithesis between Catholic and Protestant Christianity, each with its own view of the Church, the sacraments and the ministry, in other words, of the way of appropriating the salvation offered by God through Christ. This, of course, cannot be brought about by compromise, by sacrifice of personal convictions, or by "the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences" as the Lambeth Appeal suggests. It must come either by the conversion of one group to the views of the other or by an advance of both to a higher position which will include the truth of both and yet will have gone beyond both. For this "nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God." When and how no one can foretell. It is now a hope a little more hopeful, a desire

¹ *The Christian Union Quarterly*, July, 1921, pp. 51-54.

a little more desired. In the meantime let the spirit of prayer, fellowship, and coöperation prevail.

We may add that the Lambeth Appeal has been received by the Churches in Europe and America in the same conciliatory and deferential spirit in which it was sent. Yet the non-episcopal communions in other lands in their replies seem to agree substantially with the Free Churches of England. They would be unwilling to enter upon negotiations for union without an unqualified recognition of the authority of their ministry and the validity of their sacraments. "In our unanimous opinion, without the cordial and practical recognition of one another's Church standing, proposals for union cannot be carried out and, indeed, can hardly with propriety be suggested."² The Appeal may not produce immediate results but it may be heartily welcomed as a far-reaching influence favorable to church union.

2. In Scotland the question of absorbing interest is the union of the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland. The first proposal was made by the Church of Scotland that the two Churches should appoint committees to confer on possible methods of coöperation. On this proposal the United Free Church expressed the opinion that officially organized coöperation on equal terms seemed impracticable; but suggested "that the two Churches ought to appoint committees to enter upon unrestricted conference regarding the main causes which keep the Churches apart in the hope of thereby promoting the reunion of Scottish Presbyterianism." In 1909 the two committees were appointed. In the course of their conferences the committee of the Church of Scotland made the disconcerting discovery that by the terms of their connection with the state, they were unable to carry through any effective union. This obstacle could be overcome only

² Report of a Committee of the Federal Council and the National Free Church Council of England.

by action of Parliament. An epoch-making "Memorandum" was, accordingly, drawn up by the Procurator, Christopher Johnson, in 1912. The principal proposal was that the Church of Scotland should prepare certain Articles declaratory of its constitution in matters spiritual, and get these recognized by Parliament as lawful, because it was clear that only then would the Church of Scotland be in a position to enter with free hands into negotiations for a possible union. Further action in line with the proposals of the "Memorandum" was checked by the outbreak of the war. In 1918, however, negotiations were resumed. In 1919 the draft constitution, incorporating the necessary changes to be approved by the Government, was sent down to the presbyteries of the Church of Scotland and eighty-eight per cent. voted favorably, authorizing the committee to approach Parliament and to report the result in May, 1920. If that body acts favorably the Church is enabled to continue negotiations on terms which the United Free Church has already commended.

The latter stands firm by its claims, which were the original cause of disruption in 1843, spiritual freedom without civil interference and opposition to state endowments. As matters now stand, Parliament acting favorably, the outlook is hopeful that an agreement can be reached on these points, which will be satisfactory to both Churches.

3. One of the most interesting experiments in church union is in process in Canada, more limited in its scope than the Lambeth Appeal and more comprehensive than the plan of union of the Scotch Churches. It includes not only Churches of the same name or family, but three communions so different in tradition, temperament and doctrine as the Presbyterian, the Methodist and the Congregational. It is probably the first effort made on a wide scale to unite organically these diverse Calvinistic and Arminian bodies. The movement began about twenty years ago. Then all the Protestant Churches were invited

to take part; but the Baptists and the Episcopalians declined to participate. The reasons for their action are well worth stating, since they define the attitude of these Churches toward similar movements in other lands. The Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec replied to the invitation by setting forth their distinctive principles, and stating that because of these principles they considered it "necessary to maintain a separate organized existence," and "to propagate their views throughout the world." The Episcopalians, we are told, received the proposals cordially and many in that communion "earnestly desired to see their Church a party to the negotiations." The prevailing opinion, however, "has been favorable toward parleyings, approaches and academic discussions, such as we are familiar with in all negotiations with the Church on this side of the line" (Canada). Undaunted by the declinations and by long delays and determined opposition, the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists in Canada have persistently pursued the plan of union.

The successful outcome of the union seems to be assured. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, meeting in Toronto, in June, voted by an overwhelming majority, 414 for and 107 against, about four to one, to proceed with the necessary steps for the consummation with the Methodist Church of Canada and the Congregational Churches of Canada. The other two Churches have already taken official action upon the proposed basis of union. This seems sufficient ground for expecting a favorable issue "of the most remarkable church union movement in modern times."

In Australia a joint conference of the Committees on Union of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches was held at Melbourne, September 3-6, 1918. A Basis of Union, in large part identical with the Canadian Basis, was prepared. It consists of sections on (1) Doctrine, (2) the Relations of a minister to the Doctrines of

the Church, and (3) Polity, followed by appendices with regard to Church Properties and Funds as suggestions as to a Basis of coöperation. Recent reports through the newspapers of Australia show partial and very favorable results of votes taken in the three Churches on certain questions relating to the proposed union. Of the final issue, however, one cannot now speak with certainty.

4. The German revolution in November, 1918, brought with it the abolition of the supreme episcopate of the German princes which was an outgrowth of the Reformation, and the separation of Church and state which was felt to be a step in advance by a vast majority of German Christians. The new situation required the reorganization of the Churches and the establishment of new relations between them. The foundation for a union of all German evangelical Churches was laid at Dresden, September, 1919. A Church Congress (Kirchentag) was then held, composed of delegates from all German territorial and provincial Churches, and a basis for the federation of the German Churches was prepared. This is to be known as the German Evangelical Federation of Churches (Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenbund). It is to unite all the German evangelical territorial Churches to act as the representative of German Protestant interests, and to promote the welfare of German Protestantism in general. There is no thought of creating a single Church for Germany independent of state control, but the Federation respects the independence of the territorial Churches both in doctrine and in worship. Until the Federation is effected and in action, its functions will be performed by the Church Congress which has chosen a commission for that purpose.

The claim is often made that evangelical Christianity in Germany is decadent, if not dead. It is gratifying, in the face of such charges, to read the report of the Church Congress at Dresden, to observe the evidence of vigorous vitality in the evangelical Churches and to note also the

participation of distinguished men representing both the universities and the parishes. The Congress was opened with two significant addresses: (1) Evangelical Faith as a Source of Strength in the Present, by Dr. Ihmels of Leipzig; (2) Evangelical Christianity as an Element of Culture, by Dr. Titius of Göttingen. In the latter address were statements like the following: "To us Christians also our country is more than our life. Yet even more than country or nation means for us is the ruling supreme of eternal justice and love. . . . We German Christians shall mortify all thoughts of revenge, and shall, since God wills it thus, bury the ideal of military power. We honestly shall stand for the League of Nations of our own free will, choosing for our most sublime task whatsoever the ruling of God has forced upon us through our history."

In Switzerland the consolidation of the evangelical Churches is no longer in process but was completed in September, 1920. The fifteen Swiss Protestant Churches, formerly loosely connected in "The Swiss Conference of Churches," have now entered upon a closer union in the "Federation of the Swiss Evangelical Churches" (Schweizerischer Evangelischer Kirchenbund). In an article by A. K., in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, September 12, 1920, the purpose of the Federation is defined as follows: "It is to combine the independence of its members with the great advantages of coördination, at any rate of a homogeneous activity. Nothing of the existing individuality or of the peculiar life of the various bodies that make up the union will be sacrificed, but their strength is to be concentrated and their contact will be intensified."

5. The necessity of church union is felt nowhere more keenly than on the foreign mission fields where the Christian forces are apparently so small and paganism looms so large. Space permits us only to mention the more recent efforts for union in missionary lands. In South India a statement was drawn up by thirty-three ministers of the

Anglican and South India United Churches in May, 1919, with the following preamble: "We, as individual members of the Anglican and South India United Church, having met at Tranquebar in the first ministers' conference on church union, after prayer, thought, and discussion, have agreed on the following statement concerning the union of the Anglican Church with the South India United Church." Another union in the form of an alliance has been effected by the missionary societies in British East Africa, in 1918. "The following societies," says the Preamble, "now working in the British East Africa Protectorate, namely, Church Missionary Society, Church of Scotland Mission, Africa Inland Mission, and United Methodist Church Mission, recognize the divine purpose of unity among the Christians, and look forward to the establishment of a United Church within the Protectorate."

6. In no country are the divisions of Christianity, one hundred and seventy-eight in all, so numerous as in the United States. For the last fifty years various efforts have been made to heal schism and to restore union. Among these have been the Evangelical Alliance, Councils of Churches of the same name or family, The Federal Council, and recently The American Council on Organic Union of Evangelical Churches. So far little has been accomplished beyond alliance and federation. Organic union has had but a small degree of success. The union of the Northern Presbyterian and of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was effected, but the gain was partly offset by a resolute remnant of Cumberland Presbyterians who have maintained an independent organization after years of litigation which stirred up much bitterness of feeling. The proposed union of the Congregational, United Brethren, and Methodist Protestant Churches, after a decade of negotiations, failed. The Churches, North and South, like the Presbyterians and the Methodists, have discussed reunion in conference and committee meetings, but the out-

come has been disappointing. The Commission on the World Conference of Faith and Order is composed of representatives of the leading Churches and such a conference may reasonably be expected. There are those who make light of it and are sceptical about its results. With no small degree of enthusiasm The American Council on Organic Union was organized in Philadelphia, 1919-1920. Its Plan of Union, however, was defeated by the Presbyterian Church, North, which itself, through its General Assembly, had taken the initiative in calling representatives into conference for the purpose of considering organic union. The Council is still in existence but its influence has been diminished by the action of the Presbyterian Church. Every one knows the disastrous failure of the Inter-Church World Movement, which perhaps more than anything else has temporarily cooled the ardor for church union.

The organization which has not only survived the war but has been one of the most influential Christian agencies in the war, and has come out of it with renewed vigor, is the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ. This is doubtless the most hopeful and helpful organ through which the Churches of America are coöperating in moral and social work. It seems to meet the common demand for closer relations between the Churches, disavowing organic union and standing only for federation of independent bodies. Yet there are enough voices crying for closer relation than federation to justify the belief that the Federal Council is not the final stage of church union. It must either increase and lead to something beyond itself, or it will decrease and end in a reversion to the original denominationalism whose ills it sought to cure.

7. A survey of union movements would not be complete without reference to three notable conferences held in Switzerland in 1920. The first was the Conference on Life and Work composed of eighty-eight delegates from

different countries. Its purpose is to unite all parts of Christendom, Catholic and Protestant, in the life and work of the Kingdom of God. The Churches are to maintain their separate existence but to coöperate in various Christian activities. The movement is a response to the longing in the hearts of God's people everywhere to overcome the hindrances of a divided Christendom, divided not only denominationally but also nationally and racially. It is an emphasis of the ethical and practical elements as a way of union, which may unite the Churches far more quickly than discussion on doctrine and government. "Its newness consists in emphasis upon life as well as work, and upon the international character of both life and work."

The second was a preliminary meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order in which eighty Churches were represented from forty countries. Its aim was to devise plans for the World Conference, which is to be held at a time and place not yet decided. The purpose of this ecumenical assembly of all the Churches is to discuss frankly points of agreement and of difference on faith and order. It is hoped that thus there will be a better understanding among the Churches and that steps may be taken for a closer relation between them. The methods of approach to union of the Conference on Life and Work and of the Conference on Faith and Order are wholly different. The one ignores creeds and governments and stresses coöperation in work with the hope of possible corporate union; the other begins with a consideration of doctrine and organization looking toward a corporate union which would naturally result in coöperation in work. Bishop Brent, who was chairman of the meeting, says: "By invitation on the last day of the Conference we gathered together—it was the Feast of Transfiguration in the Eastern Calendar—in the Russian Orthodox Church in Geneva for the solemn worship of the divine liturgy. Anglican, Baptist, Old Catholic, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Lutheran, Quaker, were all

there, and all there to worship." It is easy for the cynic to sneer and for the enthusiast to rave at such a conference. Thoughtful men, with clear vision of the difficulties involved, will none the less recognize that intelligent and devout Christian men are seeking a solution of one of the foremost problems now confronting the Churches. One cannot but hope that their labors will not be in vain in the Lord.

The third was the Conference on International Friendship at St. Beatenberg. A similar conference was in session at Constance, August 1, 1914—the fateful date that marked the opening of the world war. The conference was held under the auspices of the International Committee of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. There are now twenty-two nations with their national councils, which are auxiliaries to the World Alliance, and these are represented on the International Committee. The purpose of the St. Beatenberg meeting was defined in a resolution as follows: "That the members of the World Alliance, gathered from many lands and various communions and associated for the purpose of promoting friendship and good will between nations, declare their convictions that these blessings can only be attained by the divine power of Christ working upon the hearts of men and creating therein the true spirit of brotherhood; they believe that that power may be evoked by a common effort of prayer and sacrifice; and whilst acknowledging their own shortcomings and unfitness for this task, they hereby humbly devote themselves to it as followers of Christ and servants of all mankind."

The aim of this conference, like that on Life and Work, is practical and has for its specific end the cultivation of peaceful relations among the nations through the Churches which are bearers of the gospel of divine sonship and of human brotherhood. It stands for Christian international-

ism, the application of the principles of Christ to the relations between the nations.

The universality and the persistence of the efforts at church union are evidence of a comparatively new attitude of the Churches toward one another. The irenic spirit prevails over against the polemic. The unitive tendency has superseded the divisive. Coöperation, instead of competition, has become the watchword. The reasons for the change are both theoretical and practical.

The evangelization of the world, the Christianization of society, effectual witness to the Lordship and Saviorhood of Christ, economy of men and money in the work of the Kingdom at home and in pagan lands, and the realization that we have one God and Father, one Lord and Savior, one Spirit and Sanctifier—all these require union of the Churches. Above all there is the subtle change in the conception of Christianity. It is not thought of now as a fixed system of doctrines and a code of laws once for all revealed in the Bible and upon the acceptance of which depends salvation and the legitimacy of the Church. In that direction lies division, sectarianism, intolerance. Christianity is felt to be a spirit of faith, hope and love in the hearts of men begotten by living contact with a Christ-like God. Where that spirit is there is the Church, there is fellowship, there is brotherhood and peace. That spirit will as necessarily unite men as the former dogmatism and legalism divided them. Organic union must come, if it comes at all, not by synodical resolutions but by vital process. Resolutions can register only what the Spirit of God has wrought in the hearts of the Churches.

To effect organic union without corresponding spiritual transformation of the denominations would be a consummation devoutly to be deplored. For it would end in dismal failure. So long as a plan of organic union can be defeated, it ought to be defeated. When, under the power of the Spirit of Christ, the Churches are ready for union,

it will come with irresistible force. Men can no more stop it than they can beget it. At most they can only formulate and direct it.

Christians, the world over, are feeling that there is something greater than a denomination or than all denominations, and that is the Kingdom of God for which all denominations exist. Once it was presumed that the Kingdom was coextensive with a particular church and men were brought into the Kingdom only through the door of that church. Such a view necessarily ends in sectarianism and bigotry, though it is held with sincerity and deep conviction, and often with an enthusiasm that makes martyrs. Now, however, men are coming under the grip of a new idea of the Kingdom of God—the reign of righteous love as manifested by God in Christ, in the universe of matter and mind and in the hearts of men and nations. All the Churches serve its end and find their true mission and glory in working together for its establishment throughout the world. This vision of the Kingdom enables us to see, in their true perspective, the things that once divided the Churches—things which recede into the background and diminish in size as Christ and His Kingdom loom large and increase in importance in thought and action.

While men choose to work in different ways, to worship in different forms, and to define the objects of revelation and of Christian experience in different terms, they are Christian only as they live and die for the Kingdom, not because they are Episcopalian, Lutheran, Baptist, Presbyterian, or Congregational. In time these names may be known only in history and the groups which they now designate may be united in a new Christian Communion in which all the members will be co-workers with God in Christ in the spirit of faith, hope and love.

LANCASTER, PA.

IV

THE GLORY OF THE MINISTRY

A. E. DAHLMANN

The glory of the ministry is the glory of life-service. The subject is not meant to suggest any special dignity and glory of the individual minister in which he excels the representative of any other line of service, nor any superiority of the clericals as a body over the members of any other profession. Any Christian minister who glories in himself, his ability, accomplishments, achievements or his success, is not what he pretends to be, a servant of Him "Who sought not His own glory but that of Him Who sent Him"; Who "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many." "Let no one glory in men," says the apostle, for what have we of ability or power, of opportunity or success, that was not given to us. The spirit of the true servant of Christ is that of St. Paul when he says: "God forbid that I should glory save in Christ, in Whom the world is crucified to me and I to the world."

The true minister of Christ glories in the great privilege of life-service of Him who served us with His life on earth, His atoning death, His victory over death and the grave, and the outpouring of His spirit; Who serves us with everything that gives real value to life, victory to death and an eternity of blessedness. He realizes in sincere humility that he is called to the ministry not by any merits of his own, not by anything in him giving him a claim for the honor, but by the grace of God; and at the same time he realizes that the calling of the minister is the highest and greatest any one can engage in.

This statement seems contradictory to the fact that many clericals exchange the ministry for a secular calling, and that at best comparatively few young men become candidates for the ministry. The small salaries of the ministry, barely sufficient even for a meager support of some of them and their families, are mentioned as explanations of this fact. Any one for whom the money income is the determining factor for his entering or remaining in the ministry is actuated by the wrong motive and has mistaken his calling; and the sooner he recognizes it the better for him and the work of the kingdom. He has never felt the regenerating, spiritually vitalizing touch of Christ in his soul which is essential for life service. Those who have consecrated themselves to Christ for such service, who love Him because He first loved them, are the true and genuine ministers of the gospel. And although they are assured that the King whom they serve will provide for them, their motive for life service is not any consideration of financial gain or material advantage but their clear and convincing vision, yea their realization, of the dignity and glory of this service. Wherein does this glory of the ministry consist?

I. In the *Message* it brings. The Christian ministry has a God-given message for all the changing conditions and times of the life of the individual and of the world. For the seemingly dark and troublous time in which we live, it has *the* message which gives light and help, courage and power for the solution of the great and trying problems of today. It is a message of fundamental truths, old but ever new, which are the foundation of individual, social, national and international righteousness and well being; a message adapted to the needs of every age, and therefore ever new, but differing in expression according to the needs of the age. It is a message which reveals the great malady at the bottom of all the troubles, evils and sufferings with which the world is afflicted today. That malady is neither

imperialism nor commercialism, neither autocracy nor bolshevism; these are all outgrowths of that deadly malady, poisonous fruits yielding a colossal harvest of blood and devastation, disease and famine, injustice and oppression, vengeance and hatred, and threatening the destruction of civilization in the old world. That malady is sin, individual, social, national and international sin; sin of which no nation is guiltless, to which every nation has contributed its share; sin in the human heart in the innermost tendencies and motives, perverting thought and judgment, influencing decision and action, corrupting character and life.

But the message of the ministry also brings the remedy. This remedy is not democracy, nor is it a league of nations, international agreements or conferences for limitation of armaments, it is not intellectual enlightenment, neither is it the dominance of force of a few powerful nations over others. The remedy is found in the revelation of God which we have in the Lord Jesus Christ. It reveals to us a personal God who is the righteous and holy ruler of the world, who will call individuals and nations to account and in His own time visit just retribution on the evildoer who persists in sin. But this God of holiness is essentially a *God of love, yea love itself*. That is the revelation we have in Christ. He teaches that God's relation to man is not merely that of an austere judge who is to every form of evil a consuming fire, but preëminently and fundamentally that of a loving father who pities and forgives, and grieves when man by his persistence in wrongdoing makes such forgiveness and mercy impossible. He who was cradled in Bethlehem's manger, who was without any blemish or spot of sin, whose life was one sacrificial service of love, by whose word sickness, suffering and sin were vanquished, whose death was the supreme sacrifice for the freedom and life of a sin-enslaved humanity, whose resurrection scattered the gloom, the terror, the despair of

death and the grave and brought life and immortality to light; whose ascension crowned him as King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and whose personal touch on the human heart cleanses and transforms it to become the source of a righteous, peaceful and blessed life of love and service, radiating hope and comfort, joy and peace to others,—*He* reveals God to us. His holy life speaks to us of the holiness of God; His wonderful works of loving kindness and healing power speak to us of the loving kindness and tender mercy of God in comforting the distressed, in liberating the oppressed, in healing infirm and sin-sick souls and displacing the cry of despair with heavenly joy. His self-sacrifice and atoning death upon the cross proclaim to the world until time shall be no more and give the theme to the hymn of praise of a regenerated humanity, resounding through the ages, that *God is love*, a love which takes the burden of human sin and guilt upon Himself and by vicarious suffering cancels it; a love which appeals to the nobler traits left in human nature, brings man down from his imagined heights of self-righteousness, conceit and pride, in contrition and repentance, so that the Father can take men and women to His heart as His dear children and enable them to live in the sunshine of His love forevermore. It is thus that Jesus reveals the Father. The apostle Phillip asked the Lord: "Show us the Father and it sufficeth us." That is the cry of the human heart: "Show us, tell us something definite and certain in answer to the burning question of our hearts: Is there a God, the creator and ruler of the universe? Is there a divine plan for the life of the individual, of the nation and of the world? Is there wisdom and goodness ruling my life, your life, the life of the world? Is there any remedy for sin? Is there any assurance that good will conquer evil in human history? Is there anything like a divine sustaining and comforting power in the ills, sorrows and sufferings of life? Is there any assurance of an immortality and a heavenly life hereafter?"

Here is the answer to that cry: "He that seeth Me seeth the Father." *Jesus* gives the assuring, satisfying answer. But we must *see* Him. Phillip and the other apostles saw Him with the eye of the body. But thus they did not see His inner life, the beauty and holiness of His soul, the power and glory of His divine-human personality. It was the *spiritual* vision with which they beheld His glory, "the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." We can experience the power of His spirit to change and purify the inmost tendencies of our nature, to give comfort and peace to our hearts; His presence and influence upon our souls in the secret place of prayer, His presence and help in the hours of temptation, doubt and sorrow. Thus He becomes to us incomparably more than an idea, or merely a great historical personage. He becomes to us not only the *Jesus* of Bethlehem and Calvary, but the *Jesus* of resurrection power, of heavenly glory; the *Jesus* our *friend* and *saviour*, present with us every day, who carries us safely through life's storms and dangers to the Father's house.

Here we have the message of the ministry. Seeing Him we see the Father; and thus in Him we have the answer to all the questions of our minds, to all the longings of our hearts; the solution of the great and vital problems of our lives and the world's life. Is there any greater, more important, more glorious message than this? The world owes much to the investigations of science and philosophy, to invention and discovery. But the light of truth they give and the benefits they confer pale before the light and power of this message of the ministry as the candle light before the light of the sun in its noonday brilliancy. It invests the calling of the ministry with a dignity and glory exceeding by far that of any other calling.

II. The *nature* of the *service* it renders invests the calling of the ministry with glory. It *enlightens the mind* with the truth of God. The profession of the teacher in com-

municating secular knowledge is of vital importance for the training of the mind. The teacher renders a great and exacting service in training the intellect to think, in opening the fields of knowledge to the scholar and student which enable him to do the work of this world and to appreciate and enjoy what the things of time and sense have to offer. In doing so, if he stands in the right relation to God as revealed in Christ, he can exert a great and good influence in the development of character and in directing the life of the scholars in the right channels, by the example and testimony of his own Christian character and life. And his claim of a higher evaluation and better remuneration of his services is certainly justified. But of how much greater importance and value are the services of the minister of the gospel, who as the ambassador of Christ brings a message which gives the true life to men here and hereafter; who is the teacher of a truth not man-made by a process of reasoning but God-inspired, a truth which answers the highest wants of the human mind and heart and life, satisfies man's highest aspirations, solves for him the great problem of the purpose and meaning of life, and as a powerful beacon-light throwing its rays over the dark and icy ocean which separates time from eternity, it illumines the shore of the beautiful land beyond, which is to be our eternal home.

And this truth, which it is the greatest privilege of the minister to proclaim and teach, certifies and approves itself as such to the mind and conscience and in the life of every one who is willing to receive it. It is a truth which for verification does not depend upon external observation like the theories of natural science; neither does its certainty depend upon a demonstration by a logical process of reasoning. Its verification is a matter of personal experience on the part of every one who opens his mind and heart to its influence. That it gives the peace of forgiveness to the conscience, cleansing to the heart, purification of mo-

tive, strength to the will to be loyal to God and man, to love and serve; comfort in sorrow and assurance of eternal life in death, is the experience of every one who honestly and sincerely puts this truth to the test according to the word of Christ: "He that willeth to do the will of My heavenly Father shall know (wird inne werden), of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of Myself." Hear the testimony of Paul's experience: "The gospel is a power of God unto salvation for every one that believeth"; and again, "I know whom I have believed and am assured that He will keep that which I have committed to Him until that day." Hear John: "Our faith is the victory which hath overcome the world." Hear Luther at Worms as he declares that living or dying he will stand by the word of God, "I can do no otherwise, God help me, Amen." Hear the missionary in the wilds of Africa: "I am in the Lord's hands, He hath not forsaken me and will not forsake me now." And that is the testimony of every one who has put his trust in God as revealed in Christ and surrendered himself to the Saviour; the testimony of His life and His dying hour: I know whom I have believed, for I experience His saving grace. "Come and see, taste that the Lord is good," is the great message of the ministry to a sinful, needy and dying world; and he who listens and puts it to the test with an upright heart will testify: "I know that He is *the* Saviour, for I have experienced the comforting, sanctifying and saving power of His love."

The service the ministry renders transcends in value that of any other work or profession because by enlightening the minds with the saving truth of God, in and through the light of truth, it brings the *peace of God* into their hearts. The cry for peace rises in plaintive and heart-rending tones from the world today. The war was said to be waged to end war, and its results as we see them today are continuous wars and bloodshed, destruction of life and property, the bitterest hatred and most savage op-

pression, pestilence and famine throughout great parts of the world, reaping a harvest of many thousands day by day. O, that peace would come, is the cry of the world today, voiced so well in President Harding's call for a conference of the representatives of the leading nations of the world at Washington for the limitation of armaments. And the cry of many hearts is for an inner peace, for something which gives rest and quiet from the anxieties, worries, disappointments and sorrows of life. The service of the minister is to bring the assurance to anxious and troubled hearts: "the Lord is thy peace"; that Lord who says to us all as He did to His disciples: "my peace I give to you, my peace I leave with you; not give I as the world giveth; let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid!" And that He fulfills this kingly word, this wonderful promise, is the experience not only of the psalmist who exclaims with exultant gratitude "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on Thee," but of all who trust Him. What a glorious service of the ministry to bring this message of peace to troubled hearts: "the Lord careth for you; the Lord provides; when the need is the greatest His deliverance is at hand; for though He chastises He will never forsake you; though the storms of life rage round about you as the storm of the sea of Galilee raged about the frail fishing boat, yet the everlasting arms are round about you to keep you and carry you through to the desired haven. And those who trust Him who has given the promise and commissioned the messenger are never disappointed."

A glorious service of the ministry to be messengers of peace to anxious hearts worried by the troubles and wounded by the sore afflictions of life. A more glorious service still to bring glad tidings of *forgiveness and peace* to hearts *burdened and groaning under the guilt of sin!* That is the great privilege of the ministry of the gospel to show sin-burdened souls the way to divine forgiveness and

the peace it brings, to proclaim liberty to the captive and set the prisoner free. Sin is the great malady of our time and of all time. We speak of the causes of the great world war. *The* cause is sin, not only of one nation but of all nations, iniquity crying to heaven. And the cause of the grievous condition of the world today threatening still greater confusion and chaos is sin in the various forms of selfishness, greed, lust, envy, vengeance and hate. Laws, political and commercial schemes, inventions, international agreements, leagues of nations and the like will bring no lasting improvement until individuals and nations have come to a consciousness of sin and true repentance. But when man has become conscious of his sin and sees himself in the light of God's righteousness and holiness, when man realizes his guilt and inner corruption, his responsibility and accountability to God; when he recognizes in accusing and condemning conscience the voice of a holy God before whom sin cannot stand, then shame, self-loathing, anguish and fear storm through his soul and he realizes the meaning of that word of scripture, "there is no peace for the wicked." Then it is that the message that God as revealed in Christ, the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, is love, that He forgives the sin, cancels the guilt, and takes the repentant sinner as his dear child to his heart of love, without any expiation or reparation on the part of man, merely of grace for the sake of Christ's merits; then this message brings the sweet peace of forgiveness into human hearts, quiets the raging storm of self-accusation and condemnation, transforms fear into childlike trust, self-will into self-surrender, sorrow into joy, indifference and dislike to God into love and devotion. What glorious service this is of the ministry, to be messengers of peace divine to sorrowing, guilty and sin-sick souls! Is there any service to be compared with this?

But this service is greater and more glorious still. It brings the *spiritual life-giving* and *regenerating power* of

God into the life of the individual and society. As a man thinketh in his heart so is he. The heart stands for that which is deepest in the human soul, the emotion and the will. Our thoughts are not merely the product of our reasoning faculty. The viewpoint from which they proceed, the direction which they take, the object on which they are centered, the conclusions which they reach, are dictated by our attitudes, our tendencies, our emotional life, that which is deepest in human nature, furnishing the strongest motives which influence and are determinants of our decisions and actions. To "think in our heart" refers to the deepest and strongest convictions we have, which grow out of and are determined by our emotional life. A man may express thoughts which are not in harmony with these convictions. Such thoughts do not reveal his real character or what he really is. They may be like the powder and paint and padding many use to hide the defects of countenance and physical deformity, which please and deceive the unwary and credulous but only for a while. The thoughts and actions which express the convictions of his heart reveal what the person really is; and though he may succeed for a while in hiding his real self behind an artfully constituted exterior, that real self will come out in course of time to the surprise or disgust of others. Therefore it is a truism that out of the heart are the issues of life. The heart, the emotional and volitional nature is the well-spring as of our thoughts so of our actions, of the whole trend of our life and its results for ourselves and others. Therefore any improvement of our circumstances, any real betterment of the sad and deplorable conditions of the world today which tend toward dissolution and moral breakdown, any reformation and uplift of society must proceed from a change of heart of the individuals which constitute society and give it its tone and trend. And any betterment, moral improvement of the individual requires as its essential condition a complete

change of heart, of the wrong tendencies, sentiments, desires, the selfish and impure motives dominating his life. If the life is to be clean, the well-spring from which it flows, the heart, must be clean. Therefore our Lord says: except a man be born again he cannot *see*, and again, except a man be born of the water, etc., he cannot *enter* into the kingdom.

Now this complete change of heart, this restoration to wholeness and soundness of the center and well-spring of our whole personal life, cannot be brought about by the acquisition of knowledge, or the attainment of intellectual or æsthetic culture, it is not the result of the mere activity of our will by our decisions and resolutions, not the result of a moulding and training process merely depending upon our will. Let any one who thinks it is honestly try it and learn by his own discouraging experience the result. This change of heart must be wrought by God as an act of divine grace in the soul of man. And it is so wrought, that is the assurance of the word of God and the experience of thousands. It is the *message* and *service* of the minister of the gospel by which God and the Holy Spirit accomplishes this work of renewal and regeneration of the heart in the human soul. Where is there a service to be compared to this of the ministry? The scientist by observation and research discovers the laws and forces of the material world and makes them available for the temporal advancement and progress of man. The inventor harnesses these physical forces to the car of human progress to increase the conveniences and pleasures of life in this world. The artist endeavors to realize his ideal of beauty in marble, color or music, in order to satisfy the sense of the beautiful implanted in man and to displace the enslaving gratification of the lower nature by the pleasures of refinement and culture. The physician heals and relieves the ailments of the body. The secular educator communicates knowledge for the training of the intellect which gives

man power to obtain what he considers his due of satisfaction out of this world. The philosopher tries to solve the great problems of human life and destiny and God by a process of reasoning which may satisfy man's inborn thirst for knowledge, but not that for righteousness, peace and assurance in regard to the life to come. As to the greatest, highest and most essential need of man they all fall short, that need which, if it remains unsatisfied, leaves an aching void in human hearts and lives which nothing else can fill; an undertone of sadness and despair casting a pall of gloom over all the other values, satisfaction and joys such as one may find in life, and changing the buoyant and hopeful outlook such as one may have had into apathetic resignation to the inevitable. That is the glory of the ministry of the gospel that it gives what all secular ministries lack, may their service be ever so great and brilliant, viz., the message which brings to the heart of man cleansing from the stains and deliverance from the power of sin, healing to the soul, the power of a higher and better life of righteousness illumining for others the path through life's temptations, trials and conflicts to victory; the power of love and self-sacrificing service and the great joys of assurance and certainty as to the wonderful and blessed future in the land beyond death's cold, sullen stream, of which future the apostle speaks in the glowing terms: "Eye hath not seen, etc. . . ." And what this service does for the individual it does for society which is made up of individuals. It brings the leaven of a higher spiritual life into society, and is *the* factor above all others which can make this world a fit place to live in. Over against this service of the ministry how petty and insignificant appear all other activities and ministries in which men can engage. No wonder even the highly gifted Apostle Paul, filled with the spirit, astounded at the greatness and glory of this service, exclaims: "Who is sufficient for these things?"

III. The ministry is a great and glorious calling on ac-

count of the *reward* it brings. You say it is the poorest paid service of any. What are called good salaries of ministers are scarcely sufficient to provide the comforts of life and educate a number of children. Many ministers' salaries barely keep the wolf from the door. I do not deny it, and yet it is true that the reward of the faithful minister is great and glorious. Your judgment is warped if you think that the greatest reward of service is paid in dollars and cents. The grateful love of the child is the mother's greatest reward for all the sacrifice she has made for the child. The appreciation, honor and love is the best reward a conscientious ruler seeking the welfare of the citizens can desire. But is popularity, appreciation and honor on the part of his parishioners and the public always the reward of the faithful minister of Jesus Christ? Is it not often in reverse ratio to his faithfulness, the more faithful he is the less the popularity and appreciation? Is the reward found in the external success he achieves? Is it not often the case that the most conscientious and devoted pastor has a rather slim attendance at his services and a small increase of membership; and finally with a heavy heart resigns his pastorate on account of the want of sympathy, understanding and coöperation on the part of his members? And yet his reward is great and glorious. Repeatedly he experiences the fulfillment of the promise of his Lord: "My word shall not return unto me void, but shall accomplish that whereunto I send it." Though the harvest of souls may not be as plentiful as he would like, he finds souls, young and old, who have been brought into the kingdom by his efforts. And their confidence, gratitude and regard, their prayers in his behalf as well as their hearty and joyful support and coöperation bring the sunshine of heaven into his heart and life. And when he has continued at a congregation for a number of years his parishioners will honor, trust and love him as a father and make the latter years of his life bright and cheerful, so that he experiences the fulfillment of the divine promise:

"At evening time it shall be light." No other calling brings such happy experience. The consciousness of saving souls from a life of sin and leading them to a life of righteousness and loving service, in fellowship with the Lord Jesus Christ; leading them to spiritual riches of faith and love, of peace and joy, which all the wealth of the great money kings of the world could not buy; this consciousness brings a happiness beyond expression, transfiguring the soul with something of the glory of the world to come. To hear the word from dying lips: to you I owe it that I have found Jesus and rejoice in the assurance that I will soon be with Him forever, and to feel the loving, grateful pressure of the hand soon to be cold in death, these are rewards worth incomparably more to the faithful minister than the abundant salary and comfortable living his people may give him.

But a greater reward still is the *consciousness of duty faithfully done* by divine grace, of unflinching loyalty and devotion to His Lord notwithstanding human weakness and the sinful tendencies remaining within; the consciousness that such fidelity is due not to himself but to the loving kindness and tender mercy of His Lord, who thus assures him of his loving recognition of his imperfect service; the consciousness that he is privileged by divine grace to be a coworker with the King of Glory in the greatest enterprise of the ages, advancing from century to century to its glorious completion, this consciousness fills and thrills the soul with exquisite joy, a foretaste of the blessedness of heaven.

But the greatest reward is *in the future*. He that has promised that a cup of cold water given to the thirsty in His name will not go unrewarded, will not let the greatest service of love in the greatest work in the world go on to its completion through the ages, without recognition and the glorious reward of grace. Among the hosts of the redeemed it is the martyrs, the confessors, the men and women who sacrificed themselves for Christ and their

fellowmen, the humble and devoted servants of Christ, who will be nearest the throne. Among the myriads of the faithful of all ages, having the crown of righteousness and that of everlasting glory, the *teachers*, casting their crowns at the feet of Him to whom alone all honor and glory is due, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and they who have led many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever. Are we sure of such reward? Yes if we are true believers and loyal followers of the Master; for then we have Christ ruling in our hearts and lives, and Christ in us is the *hope*, the certain *guarantee* of glory.

I have spoken of the glory of the Christian ministry, manifest in the *message* it brings, the *service* it renders and the *reward* it receives, as an encouragement to loyal and devoted service. It is worth while to serve such a master. A better, greater and more glorious work cannot be chosen than the Christian ministry. There is no greater honor than to be servants of King Immanuel in the ministry of the word. There is no greater service than by the preaching, teaching and living of the Christ, to be instrumental in saving souls for time and eternity. There is no greater reward than as faithful servants of the Lord in the greatest of all ministries allotted to man, to enter into the joy of the Lord with the welcome: Well done, good and faithful servant, etc. Who is sufficient for these things? They who in addition to a thorough and liberal education have had a heart vision of Christ who died that they might live, a heart vision which filled and thrilled their souls as nothing else can, so that they could no longer keep back their self-surrender to Him; they who have unreservedly given their hearts, their minds, their lives to the service of Christ and their fellowmen in this greatest and most glorious of all callings, the Christian ministry; *they* are the workmen who will not need to be ashamed on the great day of accounting.

PLYMOUTH, WIS.

V

RELATIVITY OF BIBLICAL AUTHORITY

HENRY K. MILLER

(Matt. 13: 51, 52—"Have ye understood all these things? They say unto Him, Yea. And He said unto them, Therefore every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old.")

All the great religions that have survived in the world have their sacred books. Zoroastrianism has its Zend-Avesta, Hinduism its Vedas, Buddhism its Greater Vehicle and its Smaller Vehicle, Judaism its Old Testament, Mohammedanism its Koran, and Christianity its Bible, comprising both the Old and the New Testaments. These books are composed of selections from a great mass of religious literature, and it took a long time and no little controversy to settle what writings should be included in a given collection that was to be authoritative to believers in matters of faith and practice. Such writings as were finally agreed upon as authoritative Scriptures are called canonical, because they are supposed to furnish the rule or standard (*canon*) for any given religious system. It is by comparing any teaching or practice with these canonical Scriptures that its validity or allowableness is determined.

In the old Jewish theocracy and later in the Roman Catholic Church teachings and practices grew up that were not in harmony with the canonical Scriptures, but were justified on the ground of so-called traditions, which emerged from time to time in addition to the authorized Scriptures. Our Lord Jesus' conflict with the religious authorities of His day had to do mainly with abuses that had their roots in these traditions, though He did not hesitate

to express disagreement with even certain canonical teachings. For example, Jesus strenuously opposed the rules laid down for Sabbath observance, which made a heavy burden out of an institution intended to benefit the people. Again, the canonical Scriptures taught: "Honor thy father and thy mother," which was understood to include the duty of supporting parents in their old age. The Jewish authorities, however, exempted a son from this obligation if he made a contribution (*corban*) to the Temple. In this way, according to Jesus' contention, the ecclesiastical authorities nullified God's teaching through their traditions.

As the Roman Catholic Church increased in numbers and influence, in like manner various abuses grew up that had no warrant in the teachings of the New Testament as we now have it, but were in the main consistent with Roman Catholic traditions. Some of these are: celibacy of the clergy; withholding of the cup from the laity; saying masses for the dead in order to shorten their detention in Purgatory; keeping of the Bible from the people; and, worst of all, the sale of indulgences, which meant practically permission to sin. Opposition to these abuses developed within the Church itself, and it finally culminated in what is called the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century, of which the German monk, Martin Luther, became perhaps the most prominent figure. Of course, as in every controversy, the final appeal had to be made to some authority for deciding the matter in dispute. The Catholics had two standards—the Bible and tradition, or, as it is sometimes put, the Bible and the Church—whereas the Reformers held to the Bible as the sole authority and asserted the right of each Christian to interpret the Scriptures for himself according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Considered from the viewpoint of the history of religion, the one standard set up by the Reformers represented an immense advance, not only in religious faith and practice, but also in political liberty, for the Roman Cath-

olic system was a theocracy, a union of church and state, whereas the principle of Protestantism either involved the separation of church and state or at least naturally inclined to such a separation.

However, the question of authority in the Christian religion was not finally settled by the Protestant Reformation, but is even now constantly cropping up within Protestantism itself. It is not sufficient to hold to the Bible alone as over against the two-standard position of the Roman Catholic Church, but we are under a compelling necessity of defining in what sense or to what extent the Bible is our authority. The non-Catholic part of the Christian Church is fearfully split up into competing sects and denominations, all of which appeal to the Bible in justification of the peculiar tenets and practices that separate the followers of the same Lord and Savior. Moreover, the revival of premillenarianism within recent times forces us to reexamine our idea of the ultimate authority in religion, for the advocates of this error make frantic appeals to the Bible in support of their contentions.

Any good text-book on Systematic Theology fully explains the various senses in which the Bible is to be regarded as authoritative for us in matters of faith and practice. One of these is called the Theory of Verbal Inspiration, which holds in effect that the Holy Spirit dictated the actual words of the Scriptures when they were first written. The originals have been lost, but, if they could ever be recovered, we should then have literally the words of God. Now it is this theory that is really at the bottom of the troubles from which non-Catholic Christendom is suffering. As a matter of fact, most of the best Biblical scholars do not hold this theory, but it seems to have an irresistible charm for all who have some particular doctrine or practice to exploit.¹ The theory has been reduced to an

¹It is this theory of inspiration that distinguishes so-called Bible Schools in contradistinction to regular Theological Seminaries, which as a rule hold scientific views of Biblical authority.

absurdity by the fact that so many who tenaciously hold it come to such diverse and irreconcilable conclusions when interpreting the same Bible. We have all heard the disparaging remark that it is possible to prove anything from the Bible, or that even Satan can quote the Scriptures for his own purposes.

What, then, shall we say of the Bible as our authority in matters of faith and practice? If the Verbal Theory cannot be held, is there any other that is more satisfactory? Perhaps it is really impossible to formulate a theory of inspiration that would be altogether free from objections, but our Lord's words in Matt. 13: 52 give us a valuable clue. The Bible, instead of being a text-book or guide-book, is more like a thesaurus, a storehouse containing a great variety of things old and new. We need not bother ourselves to settle the question whether every statement in it is literally free from error in the minutest details, but simply whether everything is useful. The Bible itself says that old things are passed away. Besides, a given teaching may be valid in one age, but not applicable to the changed conditions of another. That makes the authority of the Bible, not absolute, but relative. In other words, the authority of any particular teaching depends upon circumstances. The writers of the books in the Bible lived under very different conditions from those under which we live today. Not only their physical circumstances, but even their moral and religious ideas were in some respects fundamentally different from ours. Now both their and our apprehension of God's truth is conditioned by human limitations. It is like the rays of the same sun passing through glass of different colors.

What, then, are some of the circumstances that we must take into account when interpreting the Bible? Only some of the more important can be mentioned.

1. *The Ancients' Idea of God.*—What we believe God to be is fundamental in all religious thinking. We sometimes

say: "Like priest, like people," but we could say with much greater propriety: "Like God, like people." Nobody can form a just estimate of a particular doctrine of the Bible unless he knows pretty exactly what idea of God is involved in that doctrine. Now, not all the Biblical writers had the same idea of God.

There is a certain amount of anthropomorphism in the Bible, that is, the idea that God is like a man, greater indeed in intelligence, power and even goodness, but still with some human failings. In pagan religions this idea is perhaps the usual one. The Bible contains comparatively little of this anthropomorphism, but actually more than most people imagine. We read the Scriptures with Christian eyes, so to speak, but not all the ideas of God that the Biblical writers held are Christian. For example, not to mention passages that indicate a belief that God has a body much like ours, let us consider some of the moral qualities ascribed to Him.

In Exodus 20: 5, 6 we read: "I Jehovah thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing lovingkindness unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." This same idea occurs in Exodus 34: 14—"Thou shalt worship no other God: for Jehovah, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God."

Again, some of the Biblical writers regarded God as an object of dread. When Moses was on Mt. Sinai (we read), "Jehovah said unto Moses, Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto Jehovah to gaze, and many of them perish."² In a dispute with Laban, Jacob

² There is a story that when Christianity was proscribed in Japan, Roman Catholic missionaries saved some of their sacred images by locking them into small shrines, which, the people were told, must not be opened, lest the wild gods therein would break forth upon them and do them great injury. When the shrines were finally opened in recent times, images of the Virgin Mary were found in them! Compare the

calls God "the Fear of Isaac," and when he and Laban finally came to an agreement, "Jacob swore by the Fear of his father Isaac" (Gen. 31: 42, 53). "The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of knowledge," says one of the Hebrew proverbs (1: 7). And this idea is by no means confined to the Old Testament. Both St. John and St. Paul more than once wrote of the "wrath of God." In II Cor. 5: 11 the latter says: "Knowing the fear ('terror,' A. V.) of the Lord, we persuade men." To us Christians these expressions no longer mean what they did to those who first used them.

This idea of God as the "all terrible," of course, tends to make Him distant and unapproachable. To one who has lived a long time in an Oriental country, the veil that separated the Holy Place from the Most Holy Place in the Jewish temple becomes invested with deep significance. Some years ago the then Japanese Minister of Education, Viscount Mori, mounting the steps of a shrine, with his cane lifted the curtain in order to peer into the shrine. For this act of desecration, as it was thought to be, he was assassinated. In former days, whenever a feudal lord, the Regent, or the Emperor sat in state, he was partly concealed behind a semi-transparent curtain. He could be approached only through intermediaries. Even today in some of the Tokyo stores pictures of the Emperor and Empress sometimes have thin pieces of paper covering the faces. Christians have always regarded the rending of the veil in the temple at Jerusalem as signifying the removal of all barriers to God's accessibility. God is not afar off, but is near every one of us, as St. Paul said in his sermon to the Athenians. He now dwells with men, and we call Him by the new name Immanuel ("God with us").

Another human trait ascribed to God is intrigue. This clearly comes out in the interesting story recorded in I slaughter of great numbers of the men of Beth-shemesh for looking into the ark of Jehovah (I Saml. 6: 19); also the death of Uzzah for touching the ark (II Saml. 6: 6, 7).

Kings 22: 1-23. Having determined upon the death of King Ahab, Jehovah held a council in heaven to find some way of persuading Ahab to go to Ramoth-gilead to battle and be killed. Finally one of the spirits present at the council proposed to entice Ahab to his death by becoming a lying spirit in Ahab's religious advisers ("prophets"). Jehovah is represented as approving the plan and commissioning the spirit to carry it out. Apparently the writer of this account saw nothing reprehensible in the conduct he thus ascribed to Jehovah, and even today multitudes of rather intelligent people in pagan countries could read this story without having their moral sensibilities shocked. We Christians, however, could not possibly believe God to be capable of trickery.

Now, of course, other and more exalted views of God's character and actions are found in the Scriptures, but the point needs to be emphasized that the Bible does not contain one and the same idea concerning God consistently in all its parts. We must exercise our Christian prerogative of discrimination between antiquated ideas and those that are modern and in accord with our knowledge of truth in other spheres. Moreover, allowance must be made for outgrown ideas of God in estimating the validity of any teaching based upon such superseded ideas.

2. *Orientals Are Relatively Pessimistic.*—This has come about in two ways. First, generally speaking, life in the Orient in the past has been hard and full of trouble for the masses. As a rule governments have been despotic. The people had few rights and many duties. Rulers lived in luxurious magnificence and wasted the people's substance through frequent wars. Owing to imperfect medical knowledge and the almost total absence of hygiene and sanitation, diseases and epidemics were common. Leprosy, tuberculosis, smallpox, cholera, the black plague, typhoid fever, ophthalmia and blindness were fearfully prevalent. Then, terrible fires, disastrous floods, widespread famines,

fearful volcanic eruptions and destructive earthquakes carried off multitudes into death. It would really be surprising if people were generally of a hopeful frame of mind under such circumstances. In the second place, Orientals are, generally speaking, fatalists. Everything is supposed to happen according to the decrees of fate or divine appointment. Nothing that man might do could change things. That belief, of course, destroys hope and makes people pessimistic.

Now the ancient Hebrews were no exception to the rule. They too were fatalists, and there is a streak of pessimism discernible even in the Scriptures. Happily, as the personality of God and His ethical character became more and more clearly understood, the Hebrew religion became more optimistic. Nevertheless the Bible has not a few evidences to show that the Hebrews were true Orientals in their outlook upon life. Take, for example, the case of King Saul. This ruler started out with fine prospects, but gradually he developed symptoms of insanity. During his sane periods he was generous, brave and capable, but when his insane fits came upon him he was the very opposite. These sane and crazy turns were ascribed to a good and an evil spirit respectively, and the Biblical writer says that both were sent by Jehovah! In the book of Ecclesiastes we have a philosophy of life by one of the Hebrew thinkers. The writer takes a gloomy view of human existence. All is vanity. The only good thing about it is the fear of God, but the writer is not very specific as to what blessings the fear of God confers. Moreover, he has nothing to say by way of hope regarding a future life. Of course, there are a good many optimistic passages in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament the hopeful note tends to become dominant. Nevertheless, even the New Testament view of life is not free from pessimism. Probably all of the Apostles believed in predestination, though the doctrine

of free will also was held and preached, especially by St. Paul.

It is largely due to this pessimistic streak in Orientals, including the Hebrews, that there came to be cherished with great fondness the idea of God's direct, visible interposition with great power to overthrow His chosen people's enemies and restore their independent national existence. This idea, though not absent from prophetic writings, is characteristic of what is called apocalyptic literature. The celebrated English Biblical scholar, Prof. Robert Henry Charles, pointing out one of the differences between prophecy and apocalyptic, says: "The apocalyptic writer almost wholly despairs of the present; his main interests are supermundane. He cherishes no hope of arousing his contemporaries to faith and duty by direct and personal appeals; for though God spoke in the past, 'there is no more any prophet.'" Subjection to the sway of foreign rulers (especially Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, who in high-handed ways undertook to supplant the Jewish religion and culture with Hellenism; and later the Romans) drove patriotic Jewish leaders to keep up the *morale* of their despairing countrymen by holding out the hope of deliverance from heaven in a spectacular way. The promised Messiah, as God's agent, was to effect this great liberation. Jesus of Nazareth was finally rejected because He steadfastly refused to be that sort of a Messiah. Later, when the followers of Jesus the true Christ, many of whom were converts from Judaism and some time or other held this apocalyptic ideal of the Messiah's work,³ when the Christians themselves were terribly persecuted first by the ortho-

³ About the last thing Jesus' followers asked Him before His ascension was: "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1: 6.) As long as the Christ was *visibly* present with His followers, they could not give up the apocalyptic ideal of a political Messiah; and even His *spiritual* presence for nearly two millenniums has not succeeded in fully ridding Christians of this false hope in some form!

dox Jews and later by the Imperial Roman government, they quite naturally looked for the speedy return of their Lord Christ to the earth for the purpose of destroying their enemies with His almighty power as the only way of deliverance.

3. *Ancients in General and Orientals in Particular Held Exaggerated Estimates of the Heinousness of Sin and Crime.*—A statement like this may easily be misunderstood. Like every generalization, it needs considerable qualification. It would also be quite true to say that among ancients and even among some moderns in some ways the sense of sin is not so keen as it should be. The human mind cannot easily hold at the same time two complementary ideas in perfect balance. Men generally emphasize one or the other of two extremes at a time. Much depends upon circumstances, such as the stage of development; other fundamental ideas; the relation of religion to politics; etc. In a general way the emotional side of human nature is developed before the rational (logical). One of the phenomena of pagan society that quickly attracts the notice of a visiting Christian is its sentimentalism. Life is there regulated very largely by considerations of courtesy, honor, loyalty, chivalry, etc., rather than by the requirements of law or what we call principle. Thus, for example, a breach of etiquette would be regarded as worse than telling a lie. Even today in the city of Tokyo thousands pay their homage at the graves of the Forty-seven *Ronin* (Unattached Knights), who, in order to wreak upon their former lord's enemy the deadly vengeance required by their code of honor, stopped at nothing. Neither the laws of the land nor moral considerations were allowed to interfere with the carrying out of their purpose, after accomplishing which they cheerfully surrendered themselves to the authorities for punishment. It would not do to say that these men were mere cutthroats. They had a deep sense of sin according to the standard peculiar to their caste. In many

cases the ethical difference between us Christians and people of other faiths is largely, but not entirely, a matter of emphasis. Again, sin is regarded with increasing horror when religion becomes chiefly the business of the priestly caste, which then links it up with governmental interests, so that even ceremonial infractions become disloyalty to the state. At any rate, however we may account for the fact, we need to recognize that at a certain stage of their development the Semites, like some other races, placed an exaggerated value upon the evil of sin and crime. In Greece the lawgiver Draco prescribed the death-penalty for every infraction of the law, great or small, on the theory that the least offense deserved death, while no greater punishment could be inflicted for greater crimes. In a general way that idea underlies the bloody sacrificial system of the Semites. In theory every transgressor ought to die. But that would involve the extinction of the race. Hence the sacrifice of animals and the payment of fines were substituted for the death of the offenders themselves. St. Paul argued that all men are technically or legally dead, because all have sinned, but he had advanced in ethical and religious knowledge sufficiently to perceive that the blood of bulls and goats could never take away sin.

Now, any student of the Scriptures knows that not all the Biblical writers held such an extreme view of sin, which, as already intimated, was peculiar to the priestly caste. The prophets had little to say about sacrifices for the remission of sins. They were more concerned about a change of heart, and held out the promise of abundant pardon to all who repented and turned to God. In a few passages sacrifices are actually denounced. When John the Baptist was asked by various inquirers what they should do, in not a single instance did he direct them to offer sacrifices, but he urged them simply to amend their manner of living. The New Testament does not tell us whether our Lord, after attaining His majority, offered sacrifices

or not. He went to the Temple and attended the Jewish festivals, but whether His worship included sacrifices we do not know. It may be that the deadly hostility of the priests was partly aroused by His refusal to participate in sacrificial ceremonies. At any rate, as far as our records go, Jesus' sympathies sided with the Old Testament prophets and John the Baptist, rather than with the priestly order. Hence, if we wish to understand the Bible rightly, we must recognize the fact of these two tendencies in the Scriptures, the priestly and the prophetic, and make due allowance for the one viewpoint or the other when estimating the validity of any statement concerning the remission of sin.

4. *Social Organization.*—We moderns, especially Americans, lay great store by what is called individualism. Each member of society is supposed to have privileges and rights of his own, and our constant concern is that these shall be curtailed as little as possible by the requirements of society as a whole. But the ancient world was socialistic, rather than individualistic, in its corporate life. The family, household or clan was the unit of society. That is why we have elaborate genealogies in the Bible. It is perfectly natural, therefore, that Matthew, writing a Life of Jesus Christ for Jews, should first of all trace Jesus' lineage back to Abraham through King David. In our day we do not care so much what a man's ancestry may be, but we do care what a man is in his own proper self. Again children were regarded as the property of their father, who for ages had the power of life and death over them. Thus Abraham felt no compunctions of conscience about offering up his son Isaac as a burnt offering to God. Fathers gave away⁴ their daughters in marriage, and in early times this giving was about the same as a sale. Wives were a part of their

⁴ Even to-day in Japan the father "gives" his daughter, who as "bride" of the groom's family, rather than as his own wife, is "received," which word is more commonly used than "married."

husband's property, so that when a man died they descended to the heir, along with his other inheritance, though the heir was not obliged to marry the widow (or widows) he inherited. Thus when David succeeded Saul as King, he received his "master's wives" (II Saml. 12: 8). Also his son Absalom, trying to seize David's throne, took possession of the concubines his fleeing father had left behind in Jerusalem "to keep the house" (II Saml. 16: 20-22). Moreover, a family line had to be perpetuated, through concubinage, adoption or levirate marriage, as it is called. The original motive for continuing family descent was probably ancestor worship. However, with the Hebrews monotheism eliminated ancestor worship, so that provision for the continuity of a household had for its motive the preservation of the family property. In the case of the Davidic clan, the promise that the Messiah would come from that line was an additional motive for keeping it from dying out. Then, again, in such an organization of society occupations became hereditary, the oldest son learning his father's trade. St. Paul, writing to the Corinthian Christians, exhorted them not to change the occupations to which they had been born. Especially did he urge slaves not to seek to gain their freedom. It is probable that he had some special reasons for taking this attitude, as, for instance, the fear that changes of occupation or social position would arouse opposition. To change economic and social customs and institutions is usually regarded with disfavor, especially by the propertied classes. Besides, Paul believed that the Second Advent was near at hand, that it would occur in his own life-time, so that it would not be worth one's while to go to the trouble of taking up a new occupation or gain release from slavery. That, we know, was one of his reasons for recommending that Christians remain unmarried, if they had grace enough to do so without sin.

Now, is it not clear that people living in a community

organized on the group basis, rather than on an individualistic one, would have their whole views of life, its chief interests, and its issues shaped thereby? Individual responsibility, individual initiative, individual ambition would be discouraged. Hence, exhortations implying a social organization that does not exist with us can have no absolute validity for us. We have to imagine what the precept would have been had the writer lived under the same social conditions as ours.

5. *Caste and Racial Prejudice.*—The Hebrews did not have caste distinctions to anything like the same extent as the Hindus. However, all nations have social distinctions of some kind, based on birth, learning, wealth, political influence or what not. To some extent the Jews had a double standard of morality based on sex. The Pharisees who brought an erring woman to Christ, evidently believed in punishing the woman and letting her paramour go free. Not so Christ, who would not condemn the woman in the absence of her partner in guilt; and He dismissed her with the simple exhortation not to repeat the offense. On one occasion the Apostle John said to Jesus: "Teacher, we saw one casting out demons in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followed not us." Evidently the Twelve were not free from the exclusive spirit of ecclesiastics, which has brought so much harm upon the cause of Christ.

Of more serious import is the racial pride and prejudice of the Jews. They called themselves the chosen of God. Other nations they despised. These were to be servants of the favored children of Abraham, whose destiny it was to rule the world from Jerusalem. But this sort of national or racial pride or prejudice is a very common one. Whenever a tribe, nation or race becomes prominent, it develops a consciousness of its own importance and comes to believe that it has been assigned a mission of more or less world-wide extent and more or less permanent duration. In

former days the Chinese called themselves the Middle Kingdom, implying that they occupied the center of the world's stage. The Japanese frequently use the word *tenka* ("all under heaven") when speaking of their own country, which they call also "the land of the gods." They believe that they have a world-mission to fulfil, and that idea easily lends itself to aggression upon their neighbors. The Anglo-Saxons believe that they have been designated by Providence to lead the world in the paths of civilization, and the Teutons had the same idea. Now, of course, there is no denying that there is such a thing as election in the life of nations or races. If "every man's life is a plan of God," then surely God must assign tasks also for groups of men to perform. But this election of nations and races, as of individuals, is an election to service, not to privilege without regard to character. Providence does not designate any nation or race for supremacy simply on the ground of an ancestor's merit. We are not to suppose that God has any favorites, as humans count favoritism, among the tribes of the earth. The law laid down by Christ at the time He washed His disciples' feet is a universal one, applying to groups as well as to individuals, namely, that the most useful is greatest of all. Hence, the restoration of the Jews to Palestine and the reestablishing of the Davidic throne are of no special interest to us, who don't believe in the kind of government David administered anyway. The Jews now have nothing to contribute to the moral and religious progress of the world that we do not now have, and the most progressive among them probably know that fact, for they take no stock in Zionism.

Without entering further into this matter of the intellectual, social and spiritual environment of the Biblical writers—in other words, the background of the Bible—let us now consider a few practical conclusions.

1. In I Cor. 3: 1, 2 St. Paul wrote: "I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as

unto babes in Christ. I fed you with milk, not with meat; for ye were not able to bear it." Note that word "spiritual." It is almost a technical term with St. Paul, who uses it to designate what is fundamentally characteristic of a Christian man or woman. At Ephesus he asked the members of the church there whether they had received the Holy Spirit when they believed (Acts 19: 2). That was the test of Christian discipleship in the primitive Church. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His," Paul wrote to the Roman church (8: 9). Christians, then, are persons who live, move and have their being according to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. The Christian dispensation is the economy of the Holy Spirit. In previous days the operations of God's Spirit were believed to be restricted to certain classes of people—prophets, priests and kings—but the prophet Joel looked forward to a different age: "It shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon *all* flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids will I pour out my Spirit" (2: 28, 29). Jeremiah said substantially the same thing in different language (31: 31-34): "Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. . . . I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it. . . . And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know Jehovah; for they shall all know me, from the least of them, unto the greatest of them."

It behooves us modern Christians to stir up this gift that is within us, to live up to the high prerogatives we enjoy as "spiritual," that is, men and women under the influence of the Divine Spirit. As spiritual, it is our right to judge (or examine) all things. We are no longer infants, but grown-up men and women, of full age, entitled to form our own

opinions and to act upon our own responsibility. Christ does not expect us to assent to His teaching merely on His say-so, but wishes us to understand it and, if it commends itself to our reason and conscience, then to accept it. After all, such faith is the only kind worth having. Any other kind tends to keep us in bondage to the ideas, aims and purposes of others, whereas Christ's desire is that we should all be free indeed through the truth. Let us not be afraid that we shall go wrong. Is not the law of God written in our very nature? Could we really mistake a lie for the truth? Possibly we might be led to believe for a time what is false, but we cannot be deceived permanently. We are so constituted that we naturally believe only the truth, and sooner or later we shall find out a lie. "Truth crushed to earth will rise again."

2. In the second place, we modern Christians ought to divest ourselves of the so-called cataclysmic conception of salvation. Many earnest Christians believe that there is no hope of establishing the kingdom of heaven in the present age. The world will go from bad to worse until our Lord must come to earth again, overthrowing His enemies with irresistible power and setting Himself up as a temporal ruler. The idea is that only by destroying great numbers of wicked people and by upholding the kingdom of heaven with physical force can righteousness triumph in the earth. It is the idea of salvation through some great catastrophe. During the late World War it was considerably exploited. Great hopes were raised of the wonderful improvement in world-conditions through that war. Moreover, at the present time this cataclysmic view of God's activities in the world is being widely proclaimed. About A. D. 1925, or 1950 at the latest, two-thirds of the earth's population is to be destroyed, the remainder (some 500,000,000) to share in the blessings of Christ's righteous reign as king upon the earth. In times past this same sort of catastrophe was prophesied to take place in the years 1000, 1785, 1836,

1843, 1866, 1867 and 1890, but the great calamity has not yet taken place. Why should it ever take place, if, as Christ Himself said, He came the first time that men and women might have life abundantly? Has His purpose changed? Anyhow, destroying sinners is not an efficient way of abolishing sin, as experience abundantly teaches. In the first place, as we all know, even the worst people are not wholly bad, and, in the second place, whenever there is an attempt to vindicate righteousness by violent means, it is practically impossible to avoid doing some act of injustice to innocent people.

No, while not denying that God can and does overrule evil for good, we Christians in this age of more knowledge concerning His ways in nature and in grace ought to pay more attention to those wonderful words of the old Hebrew prophet Zechariah (4: 6): "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith Jehovah of hosts." St. Paul in II Cor. 10: 3-5 wrote: "Though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh (for the weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds); casting down imaginations (reasonings), and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." What the Christian warrior's weapons are, Paul enumerates in Ephesians 6: 13-18, viz.: truth, righteousness, the good tidings of peace, faith, salvation, the word of God (sword of the Spirit) and prayer. Thus, the Christian dynamic is not physical force, but such powerful agencies as goodness, truth, kindness, unselfishness. We are committed to the policy of overcoming evil with good, and we have faith to believe that the so-called graces of the Spirit can accomplish what no amount of external constraint or compulsion can effect. To admit that spiritual means are not applicable to existing conditions in the world, or that they cannot be employed with safety until conditions in the world have

become more nearly like those in the kingdom of heaven, involves practical infidelity and gives the whole case away. If Christian principles are not workable until after the world has become Christian, they are of very little use. We insist that the world cannot be transformed into the kingdom of heaven except by the application of Christian truth to world-conditions actually existing here and now. Christ's teachings are merely the principles according to which the life of this present world should be lived, if it is to be lived aright.

READING, PA.

VI

"IN HOC SIGNO VINCES"

J. MAX HARK

When Constantine professed to have seen the Cross illumined in the sky, with the legend "In hoc signo vinces" underneath it, and then straightway turned loose his legions with sword and spear to destroy his enemies, he merely showed that he had no conception of the real meaning of the Cross, though three hundred years had passed since on it was sacrificed the Saviour of the world. Nor were those misguided hosts of Crusaders less ignorant when, more than a thousand years after, they marched, with its image on their shoulders, to wrest the holy sepulcher from the paynim with violence and bloodshed. Even they had not learned the significance of the symbol. And today, after two thousand years, men seem no better instructed, though they decorate their churches with it, embroider it on their sacred vestments, gild it and bow down in worship before it. How few of them see in it what it really is, the symbol of the divine law of sacrifice, that law which was foreshadowed from the very beginning of life on our planet! When the first throb of life was felt on earth with the appearance of a tiny cell of protoplasm, that simplest form of life had to sacrifice itself by dividing and giving one half of itself that a second cell might come into being. The same law ordained that in the vegetable world "except a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it cannot bear fruit." So the insect must yield up its life in laying the eggs from which other insects may arise. So, too, woman, when she feels the summons in her heart,

Lo, the Lofty One gives unto thee
A soul from out Eternity;
Come thou to the borders, there
His angels yield it to thy care,

must straightway be ready to give up pleasures, comfort, health and life itself that a new soul may be born into the world: It is the divine law according to which, always and everywhere, that which is must sacrifice itself for that which is to be. It is the same law in obedience to which Jesus Christ gave himself a willing sacrifice on Calvary, and so sanctified the Cross forever as the symbol of that law by which, and by which alone, man can be saved from sin and from death.

Up to the beginning of the Christian era the law of self-interest and self-seeking had been the dominant principle underlying all human activity. It had perhaps served a wise purpose. In the struggle for existence that helped to bring humanity into being, and to place it at the head of all animal life, it may have been necessary that self-preservation and self-interest should be the motive urging every creature to labor and strive and live for its own individual interest regardless of, even in opposition to, the interest and welfare of others. Certainly it was the prevailing motive. And it did bring mankind up to a high degree of efficiency. It brought about a kind of civilization that reached its crest in

The glory that was Greece
And the grandeur that was Rome.

But inevitably it also fostered qualities in human nature that eventually undermined and threatened with destruction the very superiority in man and his civilization which it had brought about. It was itself the soil out of which luxuriantly grew every sin and evil to which the human character is prone, and which are destructive of all that is highest and best in man. That this was the result we know from history as well as from the writings of Hebrew prophets and classic authors.

For many years before our era the world had become more and more corrupt. About the time of Christ human society had become so complex that these destructive forces

became increasingly evident. The very selfishness that produced some great men and a few great nations at the same time produced not only weakness and poverty among the many, but engendered in all envy, suspicion, unscrupulousness, deceit, hatred, cruelty—all disrupting factors in society—when what was needed for the real benefit and progress of the race were elements that should tend to unite, harmonize and cement together individuals and nations—mutual confidence, considerateness, coöperation and helpfulness. Hence the world was rapidly deteriorating, degradation and depravity were steadily growing worse. In every department of life the law of self-seeking was corrupting the race. Politics were nothing but a system of deceit, oppression, conspiracy and murder. The methods of business were fraud, overreaching and profiteering. The ties of family were frail and loose. Religion was a pretence, or at best but a means of flattering and bribing the gods for the worshipper's benefit. Society was unspeakably corrupt, characterized by extravagant luxury, licentiousness and the indulgence of every appetite and passion. Lust displaced love. Might made right. Virtue, honesty, faithfulness were known only through exceptional instances. The world was, if not quite dead, yet surely dying, in trespasses and sin.

In the midst of this sinfulness and universal decadence, like a pure white lily growing out of the muck and noisome slime of a stagnant pond, appeared Jesus Christ. And where prophets had thundered denunciations or wept over the state of affairs, and contemporary Senecas, Marcus Aureliuses and Epictetuses had moralized about it, where reformers of all kinds scarcely even stirred the surface of the fetid stream of corruption, this young Galilean teacher, with divine vision, discerned the source whence proceeded the noxious, fatal poison, and calmly, simply, courageously revealed the only possible way of cleansing it and saving the world. No merely superficial reforms would answer;

no halfway measures would do. The old foundations of society, of life, must be absolutely and forever abandoned, and new foundations laid. "Ye must be born again," he declared. "Put off the old man entirely, and put on the new man." The primitive law of self-seeking and self-interest upon which human life had proceeded, by which it had been governed, must give place to the law of sacrifice. Men must live and labor, think and act, not for themselves alone but for their fellowmen, not for selfish gain and advantage, but for the benefit and good of others, even though this might bring loss and suffering to themselves. The young ruler, grown rich at the expense of his fellows, must sell all that he has and follow Him who had not where to lay His head, yet went about doing good, helping, comforting, sympathizing wherever help and sympathy were needed. The avaricious publican must restore what he has extorted and stolen. The prostitute must find out what pure love is, and "go and sin no more." The shirking, grasping laborers in the vineyard must learn what justice and fairness are, and therewith be content. In every sphere of human activity the law of self-service must be renounced, and all advantage, gain and profit therefrom must be sacrificed, if men and the world of men are to be saved.

It was certainly a hard saying, a requirement that would turn the world upside down, as indeed it was meant to do. It would affect every relation in life. Political principles, economic principles, social principles—all would be radically changed, and the power, wealth and self-indulgence the former principles brought, would have to be renounced and utterly sacrificed. Can we wonder that such teaching met with general and violent opposition from all classes? Men will not calmly brook changes that affect them uncomfortably and cause them to suffer loss.

Nor was the teaching alone of Christ condemned, derided and opposed; but the Teacher as well. For He taught this way of salvation less by His precepts than by His

deeds. He lived what He preached. He showed by His actions what He meant by His words. He deliberately, steadfastly and consistently refused to live according to the old law of self-seeking, and persisted in living obedient to the law of sacrifice. Comfort, riches, power and popularity He refused with a "Get thee behind Me, Satan." Even the natural appetites of the body He refused to gratify when such gratification would minister not to His necessities so much as to His sense of power. And finally, when the opposition and hatred of those whom He would have saved culminated in the crime on Calvary, rather than speak one word that would make Him seem to succumb to the law of self-interest, He meekly sacrificed His life on the Cross, heroically atoning for the sin of the world. He had foreseen this end clearly, nor tried to escape it. Born and brought up in the midst of the opinions, habits, customs and practices of a social organism governed by selfishness, He knew what it would mean to refuse to conform to these. He knew He would have to pay the price of disobedience to them, He would have to suffer to atone for the world's sin. And He knew that everyone who would follow Him in His refusal to obey the old law of sin would have to atone for it even as He, would have to sacrifice old habits, customs, comforts, benefits and advantages, even life itself perchance. He had told His followers this again and again. "If any man would become My disciple, let him deny himself, and take up his Cross, and follow Me." He could not do it for them. They must do it themselves. Everyone must suffer because of the sinful environment in the midst of which he lives, even as Christ had to suffer. It is the atonement no one can escape who would be consistently true to the spirit of Christ.

It is worse than presumption to think that Christ's bearing His Cross can free us from bearing ours. His refusing to yield to the temptation through hunger after fasting in the wilderness cannot excuse us for gratifying our

appetites when this indulgence would be wrong. Untruthful advertising in business cannot be atoned for by His having refused to make a spectacular leap from the temple in Jerusalem. Nor yet can any nation escape the sinfulness of seeking power by unjust means because He would not bow down before evil when it offered Him dominion over all the earth. Still less will His crucifixion because the world was evil free us from the necessity of sacrificing and suffering because of the sinfulness of the world around us today. Everyone must bear his own burden as well as all must bear the burdens of one another. "Follow me" is Christ's reiterated demand. And how can we follow Him in the world as at present constituted without encountering the same enemies He met, making the same sacrifices He made? We meet them in the marts of trade. We cannot escape them in the Church herself, for do not her denominations everywhere labor each for itself more zealously than for the regeneration of mankind, to gain members than to make converts? They beset us behind and before in our social life; while in our politics conscience and conviction must ever be sacrificed to party interests and party loyalty. As "patriotic" citizens, if our rulers choose to involve our country in war, we must help to kill our brothers of another land or be prepared to sacrifice our good name or liberty itself. Until communities and nations themselves are born again, are regenerated and reconstructed on the basis of sacrifice instead of the law of self-interest, there is no alternative for the individual; he must either conform to this world or be transformed by the renewing of his mind and bear the Cross his Master bore before him.

Atoning sacrifice is the inevitable price of salvation. Unless unselfishness be made the law of life instead of selfishness, neither individual men nor the world can be saved from continued degradation and final destruction. And so long as selfishness rules the world it will make him suffer

who refuses to conform to it. He must sacrifice much that his self-interest holds dear. He must atone for the world's evil. That is what the Cross stands for. It is the symbol of the law of atoning sacrifice, the sign by which we conquer. "Not by might, nor by power," but by His spirit who first revealed the way out of death into life, showed us the way by Himself walking in it, even through the darkness of Gethsemane and the agonies of Golgotha.

And yet, although two thousand years have passed, the law of selfishness still is apparently unconquered, and as potent in the affairs of men as when first the Cross was raised on Calvary, while "the people stood beholding." They still seem to stand idly beholding, not realizing nor caring what it signifies to them to see

Truth forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne.

At best only comparatively a few individuals recognize it and are trying to order their lives accordingly in some of their relations, and they but imperfectly. Corporations still seem proud to march under the banner which bears the dollar mark upon it rather than the banner of the Cross. The health, welfare and happiness of their employes have little weight in the balance over against profits and dividends. While on the other hand the interests of the corporations are of far less concern to their employes than is their own comfort and pleasure. The two classes are ever on guard against each other, instead of good will, nursing mutual distrust, suspicion and hatred. "Every man must look out for himself" is the slogan of both, the avowed and unchallenged principle upon which each proceeds, and always with the implication that in doing so it is necessary to disregard, even oppose, the interests of the other. In the economic as in the industrial world anything at all that diminishes profits is "bad business." Competition, however unjust and cruel in its consequences, is still lauded as "the life of trade," while coöperation is condemned as "un-

practical." Only here and there, in a few instances, is it beginning to be conceded that mutual confidence, consideration and helpfulness may be made to conform to "sound business principles," that is to say, they may coexist without pecuniary loss, without sacrifice being required! The world's whole economic system is based unqualifiedly on the law of self-interest and self-seeking.

Although in recent years there is apparent a tendency in some of our representative commercial undertakings and industrial corporations to allow other considerations than mere self-interest to have place, in the larger national and international relations of man there is still not a pretence even to recognize anything so "visionary," "idealistic," even "unpatriotic" as the Cross and what it stands for. There the law of the jungle still unblushingly prevails in all its brutality. We know that the recent world war was caused directly and solely by selfish ambition, greed for power, and vengeance; while now since it is over these same feelings fill the hearts of the erstwhile warring nations even more than before. The councils to settle the terms of peace, and form a league of nations to prevent future wars, were characterized by all the old-time "diplomacy," which means that the representatives of each nation strove, not to bring about a peace based on simple justice and consideration for all concerned, but only to gain, by fair means or foul, the greatest advantage, most territory and largest commercial benefits, for their own respective countries. Justice was overshadowed by revenge, and national selfishness laid the foundation, not for future peace and good-will, but for jealousy, hatred and wars just as it had done of old. A little generosity, a little sacrifice on the part of the victors might have brought about what was fondly hoped for, a brotherhood of nations instead of a world as disjointed as ever, with nations and states as jealous of one another as before and as ready to fly at one another's throats. Apparently the law of self-seeking was

established anew as the law of nations, while the law of sacrifice was universally renounced as not being applicable to international affairs.

The greatest diplomat, therefore, still is he who can best deceive and over-reach, and win most advantage for his own land, regardless of right, truth or honor. Statesmanship is synonymous with unscrupulousness. Patriotism is clannishness, whose motto was and is "My country right or wrong," perhaps otherwise expressed by some as "My country must be right." While the nations are talking of leagues, associations and disarmament, they are manoeuvring and bargaining, not for the peace and welfare of the world, but each to "protect" itself, each for its own gain. There is no thought among them of the Cross or its meaning. To suggest sacrifice of even the least national advantage would be branded as disloyal and unpatriotic. The only recognition the Cross would gain today from any nation would be that which Constantine gave it, as the symbol of conquering violence and force. It is the same with our domestic politics. Selfishness is the principle underlying the whole system. Sacrifice has no place in it, unless it be sacrifice of truth and honor, or sacrifice of its opponents' rights and benefits.

Perhaps, however, we should take a little encouragement from the indubitable fact that thoughtful men in every sphere of life are becoming more and more outspoken in their conviction that our civilization is doomed unless there come a radical change. It is plainly seen to be on the road to reversion to barbarism and destruction. And it is also being more and more clearly seen and boldly declared that it is selfishness that is the poison at its root; the law of self-seeking is its foundation, the same old outworn foundation on which Egypt, Greece and Rome, and all the civilizations of the past were built, and with which they crumbled and fell. Unless this fatal law be overthrown, and Christ's law of sacrifice, atoning sacrifice, be substituted as the foundation-principle of the world in all its relations, nothing

can save it. It is the Cross alone that can conquer, the Cross which means sacrifice, and through it salvation. It will of course mean an uncompromising readjustment of our whole social system, and a reconstruction of business, politics and society on new principles, or rather on the old principles revealed by Christ.

How soon this will come about, who can tell? But sooner or later it will come, it must come, unless the course of evolution be reversed and the divine purpose revealed therein be untrue. For us who cannot doubt Him, it is but hopefully to work for and patiently await that fulness of time when the world shall have cast off the tyranny of self and self's despotic law and shall humbly bow before the Cross that must conquer when He who once was lifted up thereon shall draw all men unto Him.

LANCASTER, PA.

VII

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS

RECENT BOOKS ON SPIRITISM

- The New Revelation.* A. Conan Doyle. George H. Doran Co. Pp. 120. Price \$1.00.
- Raymond, or Life and Death.* Sir Oliver Lodge. George H. Doran Co. Pp. 404. Price \$2.50.
- Life after Death.* Problems of the Future Life and Its Nature. James H. Hyslop, Ph.D., LL.D. E. P. Dutton & Co. Pp. 346. Price \$2.00.
- The Report of the Seybert Commission on Spiritualism.* Foreword by H. H. Furness, Jr. J. B. Lippincott Company. Pp. 160. Price \$1.50.
- The Case Against Spiritualism.* Jane T. Stoddart. Hodder and Stoughton, London. Pp. 172. Price \$1.00.
- The Menace of Spiritualism.* Elliott O'Donnell. Foreword by Bernard Vaughan, S.J. F. A. Stokes Co. Pp. 206. Price \$1.50.
- Modern Spiritism: Its Science and Religion.* A. T. Schofield, M.D., Vice-President Victoria Institute. Philadelphia, P. Blakiston's Son & Co. Pp. 260. Price \$1.50.

Despite the alleged materialistic and irreligious character of the age, the constantly increasing stream of books on the future life and spiritism indicates the public interest in anything that promises to throw light on the mystery of what happens to man after death. During and since the war literature on this subject has increased at a prodigious rate, every possible viewpoint, Biblical, psychological, experimental and philosophic, being presented in the above and other books. Whatever the reader's attitude, he will find something to his taste and purpose. In general terms the literature of spiritism covers three periods: the first, 1848-1882, the period of blind unscientific acceptance of table-tipping and trumpet-messages; the second, 1882-1910, beginning with the founding of the Society for Psychical Research, in 1882, is characterized by earnest attempts to investigate rigidly alleged spiritistic phenomena; the third, 1910-1921, in addition to a still more exacting

investigation, has witnessed attempts to affiliate spiritism with theosophy, reincarnationism, and the New Occultism and to discover the practical and religious nature of spiritism.

Since the term Spiritualism is historically antithetic to Materialism, the term Spiritism, denoting the appearance of spirits, is in accordance with French usage, now coming into general use in English, and is here preferred except when citing authors who still cling to the old word. The two fundamental tenets of spiritism are the undyingness of the soul and the possibility of communication with the dead. But this does not carry us far, since it leaves untouched the character of the undyingness, the vehicle of communication and the relation of spiritistic teaching to such Christian tenets as the authority of Scripture, the work of Christ, sin and atonement. Is spiritism a religion, or merely secularism? If the former, what is its doctrine of God, man, sin and redemption? Is God the absolutely independent person, the Creator of the universe, or is he from all eternity pantheistically identified with the cosmic process? We find the most contradictory opinions among spiritists. Though they have a contempt for creeds and doctrines, they come forward with the odds and ends of necromancy, occultism, Buddhism, pantheism, panpsychism and liberal Christianity, claiming that their half-baked system is a new revelation or at least a rejuvenation of primitive Christianity.

Some years ago the National Spiritualists' Association of America adopted a Declaration of Principles as follows: "We believe in Infinite Intelligence and in the phenomena of nature as expressive of such Intelligence; we affirm that a correct understanding of such expression and living therewith constitutes true religion; we affirm that the personal identity of the individual after death and that communication with the so-called dead are facts scientifically established; we believe that the highest morality is contained in

the Golden Rule and that the individual makes his own happiness or unhappiness as he obeys or disobeys nature's psychic laws. We do not pause to examine these 'principles,' but proceed to cite the views of leading spiritists." Andrew Jackson Davis, the early philosopher of the movement, wrote: "The deity is an infinitely intelligent Essence, not existing separately from the universe, but entering into and vivifying all things." A generation ago St. George Stock said: "The religion of the future is in our midst, working like potent yeast in the minds of the people. . . . Christianity has spent its force and now another revelation has succeeded it." F. W. H. Myers defines religion as "the normal response of the human spirit to all that we know of *cosmic law*, that is to the known phenomena of the universe regarded as an intelligible whole."

Of the above books, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *The New Revelation* is characterized by boldness of affirmation rather than cogency of logic. He claims that five recent books prove spiritism: Lodge's *Raymond*, Hill's *Psychical Investigations*, Crawford's *Reality of Psychic Phenomena*, Barrett's *On the Threshold of the Unseen* and Gerald Balfour's *Ear of Dionysius*. The "New Revelation," says Doyle, comes chiefly through automatic writing, trance utterances, verbal messages, direct voice, and sometimes through table-tipping. According to Doyle, Christianity must be modified as follows: (1) There being no evidence of a fall, one must reject a vicarious sacrifice; (2) too much is made of Christ's death, it being no uncommon thing to die for an idea; (3) it was Christ's uncommon life and not his death which is the center of the Christian religion. All this looks very much like some types of modern liberal Christianity. Doyle holds that Christ's miracles were all within the powers of psychic law and that the Transfiguration was due to a psychic circle; in short, that the early Christian Church was saturated with spiritism. Now hear an example of Doyle's astounding self-assurance: "In re-

cent years there has come to us from divine sources a *new revelation, which constitutes by far the greatest religious event since the death of Christ*, a revelation which alters the whole aspect of death and the fate of man" (p. 97). Doyle claims that under spiritism we should have a creed uniting the churches, reconciled to science, defying all attacks and carrying Christianity everywhere.

Sir Oliver Lodge in *Raymond* approaches the subject, not as a novelist, but as a physicist. The book consists of three parts: I, Normal portion, pp. 1-80; II, Supernormal portion, pp. 83-282; III, Life and Death, pp. 283-404. The first part consists largely of Raymond's letters from the front, written in a chatty, informing style, but interspersed with English colloquialisms, as "bully beef," a "ripping dug-out," etc. After Raymond fell in battle, the father, as a spiritist, naturally awaited messages from the other side. One sympathizes with the parent's great bereavement in the loss of a gifted son and hesitates to say aught against the comfort derived even from an illusory spirit-message. Sir Oliver's well-known conviction of the reality of communication between the living and the dead predisposed him to accept as genuine, messages obtained through mediums. He writes: "I myself considered the case of survival practically proven before" (p. 85). The kind of medium chiefly consulted by Lodge is one, "who, by waiting quietly, goes more or less into a trance and is then subject to what is called *control*, which may be a separate personality, or as some think a secondary personality of the medium. . . . In this secondary state a degree of clairvoyance is attained quite beyond the medium's normal consciousness" (p. 86).

What proof of spirit communication do these pages offer? Sir Oliver allows that only a fraction of all the sittings yields anything truly evidential. Of premonition, vague clairvoyance, shrewd guessing and commonplace remarks there is much; of absolute proof of veridical com-

munication there is little, if any. Moreover, Sir Oliver and Lady Lodge, having attended seances from 1889 onward (with Mrs. Piper and others), would be inclined to accept without much question the statements of mediums. The impression is conveyed that the mediums consulted (usually a Mrs. Leonard, a Mrs. Clegg and a Mr. Vout Peters) did not know the sitters and so could give truly genuine readings. But look at the situation. Sir Oliver has for a generation been a famous author, lecturing in all England and easily recognized through photographs. He is a man of commanding presence, one who would attract attention, even if partly disguised, in consulting a shrewd medium. We may rest assured that professional mediums in England would seek an opportunity to inveigle him in their propagandism. In fact most of the sittings bear the ear-marks of "fishing" for clues or of imparting information gotten beforehand through ordinary channels. The "revelations" are generally too transparently mundane and materialistic to have originated in the spirit-world. The other side, we are told, is a rather materialistic region, in which people eat, drink, smoke, wear old clothes ("rotting linen smells different to rotting wool," p. 199) and have the companionship of cats, birds, horses, dogs. Such things are seriously adduced as proofs of survival and identity. *Credat Judæus Apella.*

In the third part Lodge discusses Life, Death, Decay, Continued Existence, Mind, Matter, Supernormal Communication and the Christian Idea of God. The discussion is a valuable contribution to the literature of the subject. Lodge is not only a physicist, but a psychologist and metaphysician of rank and qualified to grapple with the profound problems underlying the whole issue. Aiming to lay a solid foundation for spiritism, he at once attacks the current scientific materialism as expressed in the twofold denial that the universe exhibits purpose and that there exists any form of spiritual or mental entity that cannot

be expressed in terms of matter. Regarding the first of these denials, "it is astonishing that any sane person can imagine himself to know enough about the universe as a whole to deny the existence of any purpose in it" (p. 285). Denial two "is not even accurately worded; for entities which cannot be expressed in terms of matter and motion are common enough without going outside the domain of physics. Light, for instance, and electricity have not yet proved amenable, and do not appear likely to be amenable, to purely dynamical theory" (p. 286). Lodge goes further and assails "the double-aspect hypothesis" coming into vogue as a necessary correlate of monistic theories in science and physics. This hypothesis differs from parallelism and interactionism in assuming that consciousness and neural phenomena constitute one single series of events. This is, of course, the old Spinozaistic monism, in which mind and matter are regarded as aspects of one fundamental reality. Lodge regards dualism as the correct position and as "inevitable for scientific purposes," but he does not suppose that "any form of dualism can be the last word about the universe; but, for practical purposes, mind and matter, or soul and body, must be thought of separately."

Lodge, accordingly, adopting the substantialistic or personal idealistic view of the soul, holds that it is an abiding entity apart from and indeed superior to matter, as over against the actualistic or phenomenalistic view, that the soul is merely a stream of consciousness, dependent on matter and of course ceasing to function at death. Under the latter view there is no immortality of the soul, as James pointed out in his *Principles of Psychology*. "Life and mind and consciousness," says Lodge, "do not belong to the material region; whatever they are in themselves, they are manifestly something quite distinct from matter and energy" (p. 317). As the vehicle of communication, Lodge rejects the common view of ether as a subtle, invisible, im-

ponderable agent and reiterates the view (advanced in *The Ether of Space*) that "it is much more substantial than matter, which is only a gossamer-like structure in it and that its properties are freed from many of the imperfections which we associate with matter, such as friction and imperfect elasticity. It is the one continuous, perfect substance, in what may still be called the material universe." Hence Lodge uses the adjective "etherial," not "ethereal." Lodge conceives that if ether be after all something substantial it may aid in the converse of incarnate and discarnate spirit; and he suggests that this may be the key to the "*spiritual body*" of I Cor. 15: 44.

The well-known Dr. James H. Hyslop, formerly professor of logic in Columbia University and in early years author of works on psychology and philosophy, elaborated his views on spiritism in a number of books, such as *Borderland of Psychic Research*, *Enigmas of Psychic Research*, *Science and the Future Life*, etc. In *Life after Death*, the purpose is to investigate in the light of contemporaneous science the nature of the human soul-spirit here and hereafter. Holding that when fraud and subconscious fabrications are eliminated, it is comparatively easy to prove survival, he nevertheless regards it as "a very different matter to determine just what we shall believe or how we shall conceive the nature of the existence beyond the grave" (VI). What is spirit, man's spirit? asks Hyslop. Here already there are conflicting answers. One school of psychology says it is merely a stream of consciousness; another, regarding this as too much like the so-called phenomenalistic definition, says that spirit "is that which thinks, feels and wills apart from the physical organism" (p. 117). "The evidence that it is something is found in the facts which show that the stream of consciousness can exist independently of the organism. . . . Physical science has made us so familiar with imponderable fluids, with ether hypotheses, with inconceivably small corpuscles, with ions,

electrons and the like, that there can be no difficulty in imagining something of the kind to explain the attachments of personal consciousness as a function or activity of it" (118).

Hyslop's discussion, apart from any reference to spiritism, has interest for the minister who constantly has occasion to speak of life, soul, spirit. If we know consciousness only in association with the body and if we have no evidence for its continued existence after the dissolution of the body, "we at least have no evidence for the *fact* of survival, whatever we may believe about its *possibility*. . . . If we can obtain facts such as veridical apparitions or mediumistic communications that are indubitable evidence of supernormal knowledge and of discarnate personality, we may challenge the dogmatism of materialism." Hyslop ridicules the cosmic reservoir, and one form of the cosmic consciousness, hypothesis of spirit communications. Professor James, picking up the idea from T. J. Hudson and a few French writers, used the former expression and meant by it that "our mental experiences are impressed or deposited on the cosmic ether or physical Absolute and that mediums are lucky enough to tap that reservoir at the appropriate point and get messages." "But," says Hyslop, "Professor James had no evidence whatever for the existence of any such reservoir. It was pure imagination, an irresponsible invention without defense or apology for itself. . . . You cannot set up a reservoir after death without assuming that it is here before it" (pp. 121, 123). The hypothesis of cosmic consciousness differs from the preceding only in the implication of personal as distinct from impersonal reality as the background of things. Dr. Hodgson, holding it, asserted that he preferred to say "spirits" as a more intelligible form of expression than the pantheistic view.

According to Hyslop there are, outside of Scripture, only two methods of proving personal survival, the metaphysical

and the scientific, or the argument from the nature of the soul and that from the conclusions of physical science. The latter, assuming the indestructibility of atoms, ions and electrons, explains all inorganic compounds and all organic beings as combinations of atoms in various quantitative relations. Consciousness and mental processes are ultimately functional activities of the atoms, ions and electrons. But Professor More, of the University of Cincinnati, writes in the *Hibbert Journal* that "all this talk about atoms, ions, electrons, protons, corpuscles, etc., is pure metaphysics and imagination." In short the very atoms themselves are supersensible and it is pure conjecture that ascribes material properties to them. In whatever way the physicist defines an atom, he conceives that it is not a sensible fact and so in this regard it resembles what has always been called spirit, namely, that it transcends sense perception.

We now examine a few books in opposition to spiritism. In 1884 Mr. Henry Seibert of Philadelphia, an enthusiastic believer in spiritism, presented to the University of Pennsylvania a sum of money sufficient to investigate the claims of spiritism. A commission, composed of prominent scientists and scholars, among them William Pepper, Joseph Leidy, George S. Fullerton, Robert Ellis Thompson and H. H. Furness, was appointed to carry out the conditions of the trust. The original report, submitted in 1887, has recently been republished and constitutes a timely and valuable contribution to the subject. It covers thoroughly the whole territory claimed by spiritists, viz., ordinary and extraordinary sittings with mediums, spirit rappings, slate writing, sealed letters, levitation, materialization, and mediumistic development. The experiments were conducted in a scientific manner and with every indication of fairness toward the mediums invited to give proof of their gifts. The first test was that of independent slate writing, in which a message is claimed to be written on the inner and concealed surface of one of two slates fastened by a

hinge on one side and a screw on the other. After waiting an hour and a half without any response the attempt was abandoned, greatly to the chagrin of the medium and her manager. No better results were obtained at any later seances.

After unsatisfactory experiments with other mediums, the commission concluded to summon the greatest medium of the day, Dr. Henry Slade, who in 1877-8 had hoodwinked several Leipzig professors, as Zoellner, Weber and Fechner, but who had been finally exposed in London. Concerning his "revelations," the commission say: "We had a number of sittings, and however wonderful may have been the manifestations of his mediumship in the past or elsewhere, we were forced to the conclusion that the character of those which passed under our observation was fraudulent throughout. There was really no need of any elaborate method of investigation; close observation was all that was required" (p. 7). This conclusion is based on such considerations as the following: "We early discovered the character of the writing to be twofold, and the difference of the two styles to be striking. In one case the communication written on the slate by the spirits was general in its tone, legible in its chirography, and usually covered much of the surface of the slate, the punctuation being attended to, the i's dotted and the t's crossed. In the second, when the communication was in answer to a question addressed to a spirit the writing was clumsy, rude, scarcely legible, abrupt in terms, and sometimes very vague in substance. . . . The long messages are prepared by the medium in advance. The short ones, answers to questions asked during the seance, are written under the table with what skill practice can confer."

In short, the investigator has to do with a simple question of legerdemain. "The slate, with its message already written, must in some way be substituted for one which the sitter knows to be clean. The short answers must be

written under trying circumstances, out of sight, under the table, with all motions of the arm or hand concealed." All this requires uncommon dexterity, which Slade had acquired, but which the committee detected. The commission say: "We advertised in the local press and in leading spiritualist journals for independent slate writing mediums; there came but three replies and of these, two were "too unreasonable to be accepted." In spite of the fact that spiritists invite investigation, "our experience has been that as soon as an investigation, worthy of the name, begins, all manifestations of spiritualist power cease." A professional juggler performed in the presence of three members of the commission some slate-writing far more remarkable than that of any medium. This is an exceedingly valuable book for anyone wishing to look into the frauds of spiritism.

In *The Case against Spiritualism*, Miss Jane T. Stoddart allows that when a Pere Lacordaire, the foremost preacher of his time, is almost deceived by spiritistic phenomena, and a Sir Oliver Lodge is perfectly devoted to the cult, it is no easy matter to analyze the strength of the movement. We have here a series of racy chapters on Disturbers of the Dead, the Medium's Control, Table Phenomena, Automatic Writing, Spiritualism and Christianity, the Churches and the Seance and the Appeal to Science. Modern spiritism, we are told, has its roots in Necromancy, a practice hated in all ages by sober and reverent minds. Even Conan Doyle admits that the opponents of spiritism are guided in part by "that strange instinct which warns men and women to keep off forbidden ground." It is shown from the admissions of spiritists that the average medium is disposed to cheat or at all events that "many so-called communications from the unseen are merely the unconscious revelation of the medium's own thoughts, or latent memory, or subliminal self" (p. 47). Under the heading Table Phenomena some of the classic examples are cited, among them the testimony of Frantz Delitzsch, that table-turning

was practised as a parlor-game in Jewish circles in the seventeenth century: "The table springs up even when laden with many hundred weight." It may be noted in passing that Delitzsch's judicious comments on "Superstition and Magic" (*Biblical Psychology*, pp. 360-372) are still uncommonly suggestive in this connection.

Miss Stoddart points out that one who denies the deity of Christ is not a Christian, however estimable he may be. "It is upon this rock," says a London preacher, "that Spiritualism is in danger of being wrecked. . . . In the Spiritualist hymn-book the name of Jesus is deleted, *e.g.*, "angels of Jesus" reads "angels of wisdom." At their services His name is carefully omitted in the prayers, and the motto of very many is "every man is his own priest and his own savior." The author points out the shallowness of spiritism in the matter of atonement for sin. It does not rise even to Buddhism in its sense of the needs of the soul. Said General Drayson to Conan Doyle: "You have not got the fundamental truth into your head. That truth is that every spirit in the flesh passes over to the next world exactly as it is, with no change whatever. This world is full of weak or foolish people. So is the next." Spiritists talk vaguely of a "Christ-spirit," but there is nothing of Atonement or Redemption in their talk. As Dr. Jowett said, the new Revelation has much to say of Jesus Christ as a *medium*, but nothing of Him as a *Mediator*.

Elliott O'Donnell in *The Menace of Spiritualism* shares the view of a number of Roman Catholic writers that "spiritualistic ghostly phenomena" are in fact not communications from discarnate earthly spirits, but from the realm of demons and devils. The peculiar value of the book, however, lies in its thorough discussion of so-called spiritism in the Old and the New Testament, themes rarely taken up in the current literature. He refutes the claim of spiritists that the Old Testament is brimful of spirit lights, spirit sounds, trance speaking and symbolism and that

Ezekiel was a medium (in the modern sense) possessing clairvoyant and clairaudent powers. Nor does he agree with spiritists in their assertion that the phrase "I sat in mine house and the elders of Judah sat before me" (Ezek. VIII: 1) refers to an ordinary spiritistic seance. Our author holds that genuine Biblical phenomena inspire awe and terror in men and animals alike, whereas modern spiritists "do not experience the slightest sensation of fear. . . . When confronted with the angel of the Lord Balaam's ass falls down, whilst its rider bows his head to shut the vision out (Num. XXII: 27-31); and Moses, when the Lord calls to him from the burning bush, hides his face, for he is afraid to look upon God (Ex. III: 6)." But the "modern spiritistic mediums profess to see spirit after spirit with the utmost sang-froid. . . . Spirits of all sorts come and go with the regularity of automata."

O'Donnell holds that though there is an abundance of evidence to show that the prophets recognized the fact that there were necromancers, sorcerers and witches who knew the art of calling up genuine spirits, good and bad (*e.g.*, Ex. VII: 11-12), it was nevertheless against these people and their practices that God and His chosen representatives most uncompromisingly set their faces. See Levit. XX: 6; XIX: 31; Deut. XVIII: 10-12; I Saml. XXVIII: 3 and 9; I Kings XXI: 6, etc. O'Donnell, however, does not attempt to differentiate the Witch of Endor episode, the case of Balaam's ass and the experience of Moses at the Burning Bush from the ordinary necromancy and soothsaying; nor does he sharply distinguish Hebrew prophecy from heathen manticism. We fear that he has not thought through this phase of the subject. In fact he is weak in his psychology and Old Testament Theology.

It is conceded by O'Donnell that the spiritistic view that the soul in parting with the material body at death enters the lowest spiritual planes, *i.e.*, those nearest to earth, tallies with the Roman Catholic dogma of Purgatory, but "it flies

off to something wildly improbable and freakish." Nor can such a momentous happening as the Transfiguration be construed into a mediumistic phenomenon. In the part devoted to Spiritism and the Church it is brought out that spiritism has proved a miserable failure as a remedial agent in society. Its long dissertations on love and brotherhood on this material plane and the next offer nothing new or uplifting. In fact the author adduces proof to the extent of a dozen pages that in some quarters the tendency toward free loveism is marked. Speaking of a former period a writer says: "So bold and outspokenly immoral did some of the prominent representatives of spiritism become, especially the female mediums (and most of its mediums are female), that the moral sense of civilization was shocked" (p. 95). The forty-page chapter on the danger of spiritism to the health of both the medium and the sitter is very valuable.

Dr. A. T. Schofield's small book on *Modern Spiritism: Its Science and Religion* is probably for ordinary purposes the most satisfactory discussion of the subject. As psychologist, physician, neurologist and alienist, he has for forty years specialized in subjects closely related to spiritism. In a clever work, *The Unconscious Mind* (1898), he laid down some fundamental principles regarding the so-called subconscious, and here he leaves the beaten paths of most books and takes up the really difficult subjects, such as Christianity the True Spiritualism, auto-hypnosis of the medium, telepathy, levitation, and demonism as scientifically established, second sight and apparitions, sorcery and necromancy in Scripture, the Witch of Endor, etc. Appropriating an old illustration, he compares the mind to an island, in which the first mental state of *full consciousness* is comparable to the part which is above water; the second, *subconsciousness*, is the part sometimes visible and sometime invisible, according to the tide; the third state, *unconsciousness*, is the rest of the island always

invisible. Agreeing with Muensterberg, Prince and others, he holds that the third of these states is just as psychic and purposive as the first. He accordingly holds that in the great majority of cases, the alleged spiritistic revelation of the medium is in fact but the mental operation of the medium while in the third (ordinarily trance) state. He allows, however, that this hypothesis does not account for knowledge imparted by the medium, but unknown to any one in the audience.

Though preferring the word "spiritist" to denote the tenets of this false cult, he argues throughout the book that Christianity is after all the true spiritualism, "a living force, and a living faith," in spite of the spiritistic, theosophic and New Thought (so-called) claim that the old faith is dead. "Christianity is *the* spiritual faith, and the Bible is *the* spiritual book" (p. 15). With his view of the subconscious and the unconscious, he naturally agrees with Flournoy and some half dozen other great psychologists that telepathy as an established fact explains a great deal that ordinarily passes for spirit messages, though here he does not sharply define telepathy, nor meet Hyslop's arguments to the contrary. "The powers of telepathy (here really including psychometry) enable the medium, not only to reproduce the thoughts of the hearers, but the stores of memory in their unconscious minds, in which lie buried (as has been scientifically proved by Dr. Milne Bramwell) innumerable thoughts and facts quite out of consciousness. Of course, it is the medium's own conscious mind that has this power, and, therefore, only in state of trance can this be done" (p. 86).

The weakest point in spiritism is "that after fifty years of these revelations *nothing is revealed*. If we deduct from its utterances all that is clearly a repetition of theosophic imaginations, we have nothing coherent left. It is certainly incredible, if there be any communications from the dead, that none of those who specially arranged when they passed

over to give full revelations (Myers, Hodgson, James, etc.) should say only what is clearly the thought of the medium's mind" (p. 70). The two chapters on "Spiritism and the Dead" and "Possession and Allied Phenomena" are the most valuable parts of the book, since they aim to bring the Scripture doctrine of necromancy, sorcery, soothsaying and demonology into some sort of relation to heathen manticism in one hand and modern spiritism on the other. To a spiritist, but to no one else, "spirit" is synonymous with discarnate spirit. Schofield holds that some so-called spiritistic phenomena are due to spirit action, but not to discarnate spirits. There was a finite spirit world prior to man's creation. Allowing that some physical and psychical phenomena may be due to the superhuman actions of spirits, he holds that they are due, not to discarnate spirits of men, but "to the original denizens of the spirit world, that pervade the whole language of Scripture. No such communications have any necessary connection with necromancy" (p. 98).

Schofield's view is similar to that of Roman Catholic writers in conceding that some of the phenomena are veridical, of which Scripture furnishes ample proof: "Many of the familiar physical wonders of spiritism are recorded, such as levitation, the swimming of the axe-head (II Kings 6); transportation from place to place, as in the case of Philip in the Acts; the shaking of rooms; the appearance of tongues of fire and many others. *Communications from the spirit world (though not from the dead) are the very essence of the Bible*" (p. 15). In short, Schofield shows that leading spiritists are in doubt as to necromancy and that an increasing number of psychologists regard the truly veridical manifestations as due to demons and denizens of the nether world. Only three alternatives are possible: either the source is the spirits of departed human beings, or all communications come from mediums and the audience, or the messages are from non-human spirits. The

third seems to be the best supported, says Schofield. Our author pursues this dark problem still further, reminding us that the Biblical representation of "devil possession" is a fact established by science. Sir Wm. Crookes was willing to stake his reputation by speaking of "possession" in the twentieth century as well as in the first, and Professor James wrote: "The refusal of modern enlightenment to treat of 'possession' as a possible hypothesis has always seemed to me a curious example of the power of fashion."

This leads Schofield to the conclusion that since sorcery, augury, witchcraft, etc., are forbidden in Scripture (Ex. 22: 18; Levit. 19: 3; Deut. 18: 10-12; I Kings 22: 18; Acts 13: 8-12; 16: 16-18), they must be regarded as possible, though not necessarily due to discarnate spirits. The episodes recorded in Acts 13: 8-12 (undoing of Elymas the sorcerer) and Acts 16: 16-18 (the maid with "the spirit of divination") are cited as indicating that already in the very beginning of Christianity the great conflict was with the powers of darkness as represented by the infernal guild of sorcerers, soothsayers, mediums and astrologers, and that Paul, recognizing the real nature of the issue and filled with "the Holy Ghost," was justified in crying out: "O full of all guile and villainy, thou son of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" (Acts 13: 10). The conflict was between God and the powers of darkness.

On the *crux* of the Witch of Endor in bringing up Samuel, Schofield accepts the account as veridical, but greatly to one's regret does not undertake to fit it in with his hypothesis of demonic agency.

A. S. ZERBE.

DAYTON, O.

CHRISTIANITY IN HISTORY

Christianity in History. A Study of Religious Development by Vernon Bartlett, M.A., D.D. (St. Andr.), and A. J. Carlyle, M.A., D. Litt. Pages xix + 613. Macmillan and Co., St. Martin's St., London, 1917.

This book is not a History of the Christian Church like Walker's nor a History of Doctrine like Fisher's. It is more comprehensive in its scope than Allen's *Continuity of Christian Thought* and suggests to the reader Schubert's *Outlines* (E. tr.) and Percy Gardner's *Growth of Christianity*. It differs, however, widely enough from both to justify the author's claim that "it is a venture on rather novel lines."

In the words of the preface, "ours is in fact an attempt to set forth the genesis and growth of certain of the more typical forms and phases which Christianity—whether as conduct, piety, thought, or organized Church life—has assumed under the conditioning influences first of the Roman Empire and then of the Western civilization that was its successor and heir." The work is "novel" in the way it treats, not merely the growth of Christian doctrine as has been usually done so far, but each of the phases which Christianity assumes in the several periods of its history—church government, worship, Christian life and morality, as well as doctrine. The historical method is applied in a masterly way and is well defined in a statement (p. 197) relative to Christian doctrine, which is equally applicable to the other aspects of Christian history. "In this process three things went on side by side: elimination, assimilation, development. Elimination of the totally alien, perhaps also of some things of value which the Christian consciousness was not yet ready to use constructively; assimilation, partly of and partly to the intellectual environment; development of the ideas latent in the Gospel as originally received. Doubtless this Gospel was a germ which already contained, like all human embodiments of divine truth, some elements of only relative worth."

In the light of this statement, the work clearly is more than an historical narrative. It is a critical investigation and a scientific interpretation, always with loyalty to Christ and the gospel, of the factors and forces which entered into the origin and development of the life, institutions and doctrines of Christianity. Its five parts are headed as follows: I. The Beginnings; II. Ancient Christianity; III. The Middle Ages; IV. The Great Transition; and V. The Modern Period. More than half the pages of the volume are devoted to the first two parts, the beginnings and the development of ancient Christianity. The authors anticipated objections to the disproportionate space given to this period and reply, "that in principle this is inevitable, owing to the immensely determinative part played by the Catholicism which grew up under the conditions of the Roman Empire. For its forms and their influence have persisted, without fundamental change, as the main intellectual factor in the general apprehension of Christianity down to the present day."

In the first chapter the relation of Jesus to contemporary Judaism and the new things in His life and work are discussed. It is assumed that His person, work, and word were subject to the social, national and intellectual limitations of his age; that he was vitally related to, and in many respects limited by, heredity and environment; that His revelation was conditioned by the historical forms through which it came. Yet He stood above his time and surroundings as a unique person and in principle was superior to the conditions out of which He emerged. Jesus had "such intimate knowledge of God as only Messiahship in the highest sense, a spiritual union or sonship such as none of the prophets had claimed for himself, could guarantee" (p. 35). Much, however, was only implicit in his life and message, which it requires years and centuries for his followers to comprehend. "The Divine treasure of religious experience must ever be committed to finite vessels of the

intellect; and has to be emptied from one to another with difficulty, and not without loss as well as gain" (p. 38).

It is a long way from Apostolic Christianity to the full emergence of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in the fifth century. Yet this formative period, if the most difficult, is at the same time the most fascinating, portion of the history of Christianity. It is the time of origins, subtle modifications, radical transformations, of the passing of the primitive, personal, experimental and spiritual form of Christianity to the patristic, official, authoritative, and institutional form. One goes from the atmosphere of Palestine into the vast regions of the Greco-Roman world in which there is a perplexing blend of ancient mythology, oriental mysteries, Greek philosophy, Roman law, and popular piety. The original community of believers—a brotherhood with a gospel—becomes an institution of priests and laymen, who claim to be guardians of dogmas and sacraments. To this period the authors properly devote eight chapters and three hundred and fifty pages.

In tracing the development of Apostolic into Catholic Christianity the stages are clearly marked both by time and by outstanding men. The first two centuries are considered together; the "third century and after" are taken as the last stage in the process. Men of far-reaching influence after Paul and John are Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine; the first five Greek, and the last three Latin, Fathers.

The regulative principle in the development of the "typical forms and phases" of ancient Christianity is taken to be the conception of salvation. "A religion is molded by its idea of salvation. It is in this that continuity of type mainly consists and may be brought to the test" (pp. 144, 198). The idea itself underwent fundamental changes which were followed by corresponding modifications in worship, government, discipline, piety and doctrine. This point of view is not wholly new but it is maintained and

its implications are worked out with a consistency in an exposition of Christian developments of the first five centuries, that gives originality and freshness to the book as a whole.

Salvation, as held by Jesus and the apostles, is defined as inward, personal and experimental, whether as corporate or individual. It was "eternal life" and consisted in knowing God as Father revealed in Christ. The term "knowing" is to be used in the Hebraic sense as "an attitude of the moral personality involving all the soul and showing itself in grateful gladness as at 'good news' received. This attitude was generally described as faith . . . and those in possession of such new life were 'believers' or 'saints,' *i.e.*, consecrated to God and His will" (p. 339). From stage to stage the subtle modification of this conception of salvation, under the influence of Greek thought, oriental mysteries, Jewish legalism, Roman imperialism, and vulgar piety, is shown in concise but comprehensive sections based upon thorough knowledge of the sources and the primary authorities. Changes in the idea of salvation were followed, as with inevitable necessity, by corresponding modifications in the spirit and form of worship, in manner of government and discipline, in the motives of Christian living, and even in theological and christological dogmas. "Everywhere else we see transvaluation of typical terms, such as Gospel, Church, Faith, Saint, the Communion of Saints" (p. 332). In contrasting the earlier and later interpretations of Christianity, in the one Christ is said to overshadow all else, in the other the Church. The Church came to be regarded "as a sacred and wonderful 'mystery' or sacramental entity, bodying forth a system of Divine energies, in which men shared primarily through material means of grace. The Church was, in fact, the all-embracing Sacrament or channel of Salvation, as an institution and apart from its actual members" (p. 335).

Another distinctive characteristic of this work is the way

in which the later part of the medieval period is related to the earlier part of the modern period. Emphasis is put on the continuance of many medieval elements into modern thought and life. The Reformation was not an abrupt change from an old to a new order, rather a gradual transition in which medieval ideas lingered on in modern times. In their thought and general outlook on life, Catholics and Protestants were hedged in to a large extent by the categories of the ancient world as handed down and elaborated by the Middle Age. On this account the fourth part has for its heading, not "The Reformation" as one naturally expects, but "The Great Transition" which leads to the opening of the distinctively modern period in the eighteenth century. In the words of the authors, "as early as the middle of the eighteenth century we see the beginnings of a new movement which is directly related to the spiritual conceptions of our own time" (p. 542). This view has been set forth by Troeltsch in his contribution to *Geschichte Der Christlichen Religion*, etc., in *Die Kultur Der Gegenwart*. It is more and more generally accepted by historians, though so great a scholar as Harnack contends that in principle the modern age begins in the sixteenth century, notwithstanding the persistence of medieval elements.

The fifth and last part of the book, *The Modern Period*, traces the change from Rationalism through Romanticism to contemporary idealism. Questions raised by the Reformers contained far more than they realized and had to be considered at least, if not answered, by later generations. Rationalism was rooted in the Renaissance and attempted to interpret Christianity so as to make it conform to the human reason. It served the purpose of eliminating outworn customs and superstitions and clarifying the vision for things as they are. But it no more satisfied the soul of men than Romanism. In the face of reason with its cold, calculating dogmatism,

Like a man in wrath the heart
 Stood up and cried, "I've felt."

The consequence is "that the rationalism and scepticism of the eighteenth century are as dead as the superstition which they destroyed" (p. 542).

Modern idealism was reached by way of Romanticism. The concluding chapters briefly discuss the theology and philosophy of the nineteenth century, Schleiermacher, Coleridge, Ritschl, Christian Socialism and the forces making for unity. Brief as this part necessarily is, it is none the less rich in content and will help the reader to orient himself in modern tendencies.

The purpose of the authors in the preparation of this book was not merely theoretical but mainly practical, to present the whole development of Christianity "largely from the practical standpoint of the interests and problems present in men's minds today." Their work presupposes, on the part of the reader, a general knowledge of church history and a special interest in a scientific study of the origin and development of Christian thought and institutions. The book must not only be read, it must be re-read and thought through. It is by no means easy reading, partly on account of the necessary condensation of material and partly on account of its style, which is not always clear and sometimes unnecessarily obscure.

We commend the volume heartily to ministers, teachers, and advanced students in theological schools and universities. One could do no better than to make it the basis for a winter's course of study in church history after he has finished his course in a theological seminary.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.